

Minutes of the Tuddenham St Martin Parish Council meeting held 15<sup>th</sup> April 2024 commencing at 7.30pm at the village hall.

Present: Mr D Lugo, Mr J Bird, Mrs K Lindsay and Mrs C Frost (Clerk). There were 6 members of public present.

1. **Election of Chair for the purpose of this meeting** Mrs Lindsay proposed Mr Bird as Chair for the purpose of this meeting. This was seconded by Mr Lugo and unanimously approved.
2. **Chairman's Welcome and Apologies** Mr Bird welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies had been received from Mr Pipe (Parish Council Chair), Mr Brightwell and Ms Procter (Parish Councillors). These were approved. Apologies were also received from Cllr Hedgley (District Councillor).
3. **To receive declarations of interest** There were none.

4. **Public Forum** Comments and questions were:

In reply to questions, the Parish Council confirmed:

- that they had received the emails from a resident objector about the Keightley Way development, including the complaint made to East Suffolk Council about the 27<sup>th</sup> February 2024 Planning Committee meeting (South).
- It was not known who East Suffolk Council would appoint as the Consultant for the independent review of the Keightley Way application in respect of safety, integration and connectivity of the proposed Keightley Way development with the existing community.
- It was the Parish Council's understanding that the Keightley way development application would be determined at a future Committee meeting after completion of the above mentioned independent highway review, and that the Parish Council and public would have the same opportunity to speak as at the previous Committee meetings.
- It was commented that no answer had yet been received from the Planning Dept. about the question raised about access to the playground from the Keightley Way site and no permission for access had so far been requested. Residents hoped that the permission would not be automatically approved by the Parish Council.
- There is a lot of development in the area, such as in the Humber Doucy Lane application (Item 5(c) of the meeting). How was the village going to be protected?

There followed a discussion about the Parish Council, what the Parish Council does, the need for more members, and how the Parish Council could think of ways of engaging more with villagers.

An ESPA representative introduced himself and explained to everyone present that there were now 50 parish councils affiliated with the ESPA, and he gave details of the recent ESPA conference which had been held at Grundisburgh village hall. They were hoping for a Community Engagement Group to meet with ESC CEO and Planning Officers which would give a voice to communities. The ESPA would be writing soon and what is happening after their steering Committee meeting next week. The ESPA representative went over the similarities of the ESC Planning Committee meetings in respect of the Grundisburgh Vale and the Keightley Way developments and explained the outcome of the Grundisburgh Vale application which had been permitted.

The ESPA representative reported that there was evidence that the ESC Local Plan was not fit for purpose. He requested that the ESPA is updated about the Keightley Way development and confirmed they would assist.

Mr Bird reported that he and Ms Procter had attended the ESPA conference held at Grundisburgh village hall.

There followed a discussion about the inadequate suggestion of an additional footpath (at the back of the playing field, on land not secured, and joining Footpath 10) which had been brought forward at the last site meeting by ESC as an alternative to pedestrian/cycle access on The Hill.

Another representative of the ESPA reported that there was a precedent for refusal of the Keightley Way development as there had been a similar situation in Peterborough that had been refused on highway safety grounds.

## 5. Planning Matters, including:

- (a) Update on Planning Application DC/22/3748/FUL. Residential Development for 25 new dwellings in Keightley Way including:
- i. Consideration of comments to the East Suffolk Council Transport Consultant Brief, which is being sought in respect of safety, integration and connectivity of the proposed development with the existing community. The draft response composed by Mr Bird was considered. It was a comprehensive and robust report of all the highways issues surrounding this application and had taken into account the village feedback and Parish Council concerns about the development in relation to the highway issues. It was proposed by Mrs Lindsay, seconded by Mr Lugo and **unanimously approved**. It was additionally **unanimously approved** to only forward a copy of the report to Cllr Hedgley for the time being. The Clerk was instructed to request a copy of the highway report, when it had been completed, and request details of the independent consultant when appointed.
- ii. Consideration in the event of permission being sought for access to the play area from the allocated site. It was commented that it was unacceptable to put a footpath through the play area for the purpose of safe pedestrian and cycle access to the main part of the village. There was a difference of opinion about the possibility of access from the Keightley Way development for the sole purpose of using the play facilities. It was commented that this would provide safe access for residents of the Keightley Way development but it was also commented that there were objections to this additional access. No vote was taken as no permission had yet been sought and it was not yet known what the specific details were likely to be in the event of permission being sought. It was commented however that the Recommendation made by Planning Officers at the February 2024 Planning Committee meeting had been amended to include *'plus the inclusion of a condition requiring access to the play area to be secured and completed prior to occupation of any dwelling'*. **The Clerk was instructed to write to the Planning Officer and check:**
- Why no response had been received to questions to the Planning Dept about permission not yet having been sought
  - It had been noted that the Recommendation had been amended to include the above wording
  - That the condition of access to the play area is that they are expecting the developer to secure access to the playground?
- iii. Consideration in preparation of the next East Suffolk Council Planning Committee (South) meeting in respect of this application. The next Planning Committee meeting to consider this application was not envisaged any time soon in view of the likely lengthy time needed for East Suffolk Council to appoint an independent highway consultant. Preparation for the next Committee meeting would be made following completion of the highway report. It was additionally reported that complaints had been made to the Leader and also the Chief Executive of East Suffolk Council about the process adopted by the Planning Committee South in considering the planning application on 27th February 2024. Also, it was reported that the Minutes of the 27<sup>th</sup> February 2024 Planning Committee (South) meeting were now available on the East Suffolk Council website.
- (b) Planning Application DC/24/0840/FUL. Ground and first floor rear extensions in Keightley Way. This was considered and it was **unanimously approved** that there were no comments.
- (c) Planning Applications DC/24/0771/OUT (East Suffolk Council) & IP/24/00172/OUTFL (Ipswich Borough Council). THE APPLICATION IS A CROSS-BOUNDARY APPLICATION AND IS LOCATED IN BOTH IPSWICH BOROUGH COUNCIL AND EAST SUFFOLK COUNCIL. Humber Doucy Lane Development. Proposal: Hybrid Application – Full Planning Permission for the means of vehicle, cycle and pedestrian access to and from the site. Outline planning application (all matters reserved) for a mixed use development for up to 660 dwellings (Use Class C3), up to 400 sq m (net) of non-residential floorspace falling within Use Class E and/or Use Class F2(b), and early years facility, and associated vehicular access and highway works, formal and informal open spaces, play areas, provision of infrastructure (including internal highways, parking, servicing, cycle and pedestrian routes, utilities and sustainable drainage systems), and all associated landscaping and engineering works. It was commented that this development would cause more traffic problems for Tuddenham. The developer comment in the application that the site had good connectivity to London via Westerfield train station was viewed with scepticism. It was proposed by Mr Bird to object to the application. This was seconded by Mrs Lindsay and **unanimously approved**. Comments about the application included:

- There would be an impact of the increased traffic on Tuddenham.
- There were no proposals to mitigate the increased traffic problems in Tuddenham.
- Local high school provision is already inadequate and will be further exacerbated by the development.
- Re Primary school capacity – the Planning Statement for the application states *'It has subsequently become apparent that there is a surplus of primary school places in the local area, so much so that SCC have recently decided to reduce capacity of Rushmere Hall'*.
- Objection to vehicular access on Tuddenham Road. This is not included in the East Suffolk Local Plan (adopted September 2020) – Policy SCLP12.24.
- There are no proposals for safe use of footways and cycle ways from the site, including to Westerfield station. It was **unanimously approved** that the objection would concentrate on:

- the inevitable impact of additional traffic on the village of Tuddenham St Martin
- the vehicular access proposed to be taken from Tuddenham Road
- the lack of proposals for safe use of footways and cycleways to access key social and economic destinations, including neighbouring villages, local services and facilities, including Westerfield train station
- the inevitable impact of additional pupil numbers for the catchment high school

The Clerk would email Mr Bird, Mrs Lindsay and Mr Lugo with the draft of the response for approval before being submitted to East Suffolk Council and Ipswich Borough Council.

6. **To consider the reduction of the village bus service as from 14<sup>th</sup> April 2024** Notice of the reduced bus timetable had been emailed by Suffolk County Council (SCC) on 4<sup>th</sup> April 2024. A resident had contacted the Parish Council with a copy of the complaint emailed to the Leader of SCC about the reduction of service and the change to times the bus would operate in Tuddenham (first bus to Ipswich would now be in Tuddenham at 7.33am and the last bus from Ipswich would now leave Ipswich 5.30pm). It was commented that these changes to the bus timetable resulted in more cars being needed for transport to and from the village for work, school and college. It was **unanimously approved** to write to the Leader of SCC about the alterations and copy Cllr Bryce (County Councillor), Cllr Hedgley, and Cllr Clery (District Councillors). The approach to the Leader of SCC would include a request to look at the new timetable and restore the previous timing for workers, high school and college students in the village. The draft would be emailed to Mr Bird, Mrs Lindsay and Mr Lugo for approval before being sent.
7. **Items for the next Agenda**
  - Parish Clerk replacement
  - Parish Council communication with village residents, and other Items to be decided.
8. **Date of next meeting** 7<sup>th</sup> May 2024, which would be the Annual Parish meeting starting at 7pm. The Annual Parish Council meeting would follow immediately afterwards on the same evening. The dates of the next schedule meetings would then be: 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2024, 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2024 and 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2024.

The meeting closed at 9.10pm.

Mrs C Frost - Parish Clerk. Tuddenham St Martin