

**Wednesday 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2022 – Public Meeting commenced at 7.30pm at the Village Hall**

**Present:** Cllr J Miller (Chair), M Helliwell, K Goudy, M Clements, S Moore, K Hall-Price, (Clerk), District Cllr K Welham, 5 members of the public.

1. **Welcome & Apologies received to the extra planning meeting of the Parish Council.** The Chairman welcomed everyone to this extra planning meeting of the Parish Council. Apologies received from Cllr W Ratcliffe, M Reeve N Hardman and District Cllr Eburne, District Cllr Welham. Cllr Baker was absent.
2. **Dispensations**
  - a) To consider requests for dispensations – No new dispensations received
  - b) To note existing dispensations. The standing dispensation for Cllr Clements in respect of the proposed development land between Silver Street and Finningham Road and Cllr Reeve in respect of the proposed development of the Greenacres Site.
3. **To receive any declarations of personal/prejudicial interest.** None received.
4. **Planning Applications received**
  - **DC/22/01159** | Application for approval of Reserved Matters following Outline Planning Permission DC/19/02878 dated 12/02/2021. Town and Country Planning 2015. Submission of details for Appearance, Layout and Scale for the Erection of 64No dwellings (including 22 affordable). | Land East Of Greenacres Old Newton Suffolk. **Deadline by MSDC for comments is Friday 25<sup>th</sup> March 2022.**

**Email received from Philip Groom** – regarding plans for drainage, the plans are not clear as to where and how the new drainage will link up with the existing drainage. The manhole covers have all been inspected in and around the village hall and the request is that the new drainage should be clarified as to how the new drainage will link with the old and that up-to-date plans showing both new and old are provided.

**Appearance** – Does not fit with anything already in existence in the village. Our village is a historic and characteristic village with a degree of heritage to it and the planned street views show bad practice being used with regimented roof lines, all designs being predominantly red and some yellow bricks with only 2 different roof types, artificial cladding and not rendered which is not typically a Suffolk characteristic trait. The ***Suffolk design guide individual dwellings design principles from Suffolk.gov website*** encourages a variety of styles and materials through the design.

The Charcoal coloured pantile roof should be traditional Suffolk slate. Suffolk guidance document states that developers should be using a variety of characteristics, brick plinths, sloping dormer windows, chimneys, roofing types and bay windows and first floor overhangs. Principle developments for Suffolk and there should be an importance of developing Suffolk architecture not just standard British architecture.

The development should be in keeping with the historic heart of the village and long-term impact. All the views have no mature trees in it and the drawings are giving a false picture as the trees will not be mature for a good 10 – 15 years. Cllrs would like to see considerably more trees, greenery and scenery, there is only one mature tree being suggested. Cllrs believe that at least 50% of the trees need to be mature otherwise it will be 10-15 years before the desired outcome will be achieved.

The National Character Area (NCA) document 83 and historical statement – The NCF should encourage measures that retain a notable national character area. This falls foul of the profile and to preserve the high Suffolk clay lands these are principles we should be adopting. Our village shouldn't be over developed, and open space should be more readily available and encourage people and developers to help better use and provide open spaces. We would wish to reduce the number of houses in the plot area specified and increase the green space being offered.

**Layout** - The distribution of the affordable, shared and open market houses are supposed to be pepper potted around the site but they appear to be all in one area (at the furthest end of the development) and the more expensive properties and open market houses definitely being given preferred plots. They are definitely not pepper potted around the site.

The footpath stops at a flint wall and goes nowhere and will not provide access to other parts of the village or to the school. The route to school has been an issue for many years and is likely to be further exacerbated with no clear safe route to school and access from this new development.

All the houses have parking spaces but not necessarily near to the houses themselves and therefore car parking will be an issue on the kerbsides. The double parking provision will lead to the same chaos experienced elsewhere already in the village as seen in Greenacres and Mutton Meadow car parks where parishioners insist on parking as close to their homes as possible and therefore abuse the road, verges and pavements. Cllrs are adamant that people will take the shortest route to their homes from the car parking spaces which is a concern to the Council as this will lead to refuse collection and emergency vehicles not being able to get into the development safely if cars are parking on the road. The double parking offered one in front of the other is done to save on space and is not going to work in terms of practicality. The maisonette's alone will possibly have 8 vehicles. Approximately a total of a further 128 cars potentially trying to gain access onto Church Road which is a C road which will then add pressure onto the shoulder of mutton cross roads. The entrance for this new development ideally needs to be moved to Stowmarket road which is a B road not opposite the sports and social club and the village hall and not impacting on an already busy junction at the shoulder of mutton crossroads.

There are a number of new properties that are very close to existing listed properties. The setting although adjacent to the buildings has been quoted as not being relevant as they were approved in the outline application. Cllrs are very concerned about the impact on the heritage and proximity to these properties not properly being taken into consideration. In fact, the density of the houses on the entrance is not respecting the adjacent listed buildings and are at odds with the meadow and farmyard setting. Therefore, the abundance of houses upon the entrance should be reduced, also the front 3 houses on Church Road are very close to the road and need to be moved back from the entrance to the new development.

The borders are also not clearly defined. On the more detailed map the boundary lines are not clear enough to see if the existing properties would have access to the rear of their boundary fences and hedges for maintenance access. In addition the two end properties would need to be bungalows otherwise there will be issues with privacy and looking directly into the existing neighbouring properties.

**Scale** - Comments from Cllrs were unanimous in that the visibility splays and areas of manoeuvre for vehicles hasn't been well thought out. The Cllrs felt that there were too many properties occupying a relatively small space and the overall design appears fairly bland and is similar to many other new developments across the country. The site appears cramped and consideration should be given to moving the development away from the properties along Church Road moving beyond the Landscape Parameter line and so giving green space between the development and existing properties. Access, parking and the styles being proposed are not in-keeping with Old Newton.

It was identified that there is a spur near the balance pond area for access to what appears to be for further development that needed to be highlighted. Cllrs were aware that this could be the start of a much larger development longer term outside the settlement boundary, this area should be considered as land for development and not set aside in case of future development.

**In addition** - Little appears to have been done to address the ecological impact and as this was pushed through the planning meeting without correct procedures being followed, Cllrs are not happy with what has been submitted for approval. Anglian Water have stated that the foul water provision is not capable at the present time to cater for the extra properties and the Parish Council is concerned as to how this is going to be achieved and would like to see the plans for the new system and where and how this will link into the rest of the village. Apparently there is a ditch that has drainage attached to it from the existing houses and residents are concerned that any ditches that are filled and piped need to be connected to ensure that flooding does not re-occur as was an issue some years back which led to the drainage pipes being installed in the first instance into the ditch that is being proposed to be filled in.

- **DC/22/00780** | Application for Listed Building Consent. Internal alterations, renovation, repairs and maintenance as per Schedule of Works. | The Cottage 1 Chapel Road Old Newton IP14 4PP. This is an additional planning application received that will be an agenda item for the April meeting. **Deadline by MSDC for comments is Friday 8<sup>th</sup> April 2022.**

## 5. **Street Naming – New Development at Moat Meadow – Finningham Road**

- Developer suggested names are Salisbury / Burgess / Myklefield and Windmill
- Cllr Hardman likes like Moat Meadow, Wheatfield Meadow, Stearn Meadow and Fosse Meadow.
- Cllr Reeve would prefer not to use personal names if possible but does prefer the more traditional and historic names suggested.

The windmill was much further out. Suggested – Fosse Meadow – Another word for moat, Beanfield Meadow, Wheatfield Meadow linking to previous agricultural use of the field.

**6. Councillors matters to be brought to the attention of the Council.**

- Official opening of The Jubilee Playground – Saturday 4<sup>th</sup> June at 2pm. Request For Cllr Miller to open the playground on behalf of the Parish Council.
- Complaint received regarding the new Fish & Chip Shop van and Greenacres / blocking parking – Clerk has emailed White GoldFish & Chips asking them to be considerate to residents and blocking parking spaces. Duration at each street etc and the fact that apparently the residents have to pay for those car parking spaces as part of their rent.
- Footpaths feedback gratefully received.
- Cllr Clements to collect new batteries – Cllr Miller to authorise payment.
- Jubilee Tree – Agenda.

**7. Public Forum – Nothing raised**

**8. Additional Matters for inclusion on the agenda for the April meeting**

- **DC/22/00780** | Application for Listed Building Consent. Internal alterations, renovation, repairs and maintenance as per Schedule of Works. | The Cottage 1 Chapel Road Old Newton IP14 4PP. This is an additional planning application received that will be an agenda item for the April meeting. *Deadline by MSDC for comments is Friday 8<sup>th</sup> April 2022.*
- **Jubilee Tree with the benches.**
- **Area for tree / orchard to be planted.**

**9. Date of the next meeting – Wednesday 6<sup>th</sup> April 2022**

**Meeting closed at 9.03pm**