

**Minutes of the Planning Meeting of Fressingfield Parish Council
held in the Sancroft Hall, Fressingfield
on Tuesday 05 June 2018**

Present: Garry Deeks; Alex Day; Philip Eastgate; Judy Fullam; Tom Lindsay; Tracy Livingstone; Ian Smith; Rachael Troughton; Dave Wheeler;

In Attendance: Vincent Pearce, MSDC Planning Department; Lavinia Hadingham; Carol A Smy, Clerk to the Council

70+ Members of the public

Prior to the consideration of the three planning applications received the Chairman addressed the meeting and stressed the need for comments to be pertinent to planning law and guidelines and asked that speakers confine their remarks to fresh material not reiterating the PC's or other speakers' views but presenting fresh information. The Chairman's briefing notes are appended to these minutes. The Chairman stated that the PC would be making further representations to the District Council on the two applications that had been submitted and were to be discussed in the planning section of this meeting. The PC would also be putting forward views at the, eventual, planning meeting to decide the outcome of the applications.

Vincent Pearce advised the meeting that he would be dealing with the three applications; he was very new in post and to MSDC and hoped to bring a fresh view. He was committed to an open discourse. He had met one of the landowners, the Chairman of the Parish Council and representatives from SAFE who had given him a conducted tour of the village. He had a set of questions for the Highways Department concerning a better analysis of pedestrian safety, traffic speeds and the expansion of the survey area. He was very concerned that along New Street pedestrians had to move into the thoroughfare to be able to cross from one side to the other. The answers would be put in the public domain. The District Council's deliberations on the three planning applications for large developments had been postponed, yet again, until the first of August with a referral panel meeting after that date. He stated that, as he was new in post, he could not give the best advice in a shorter time. The DC's Land Bank was still below requirements but Government diktats were paramount and so developments would go ahead in order to fulfil national targets. But...developments must be sustainable and although the three proposed developments seemed to be too large for the village planning dictates that they could be viable. VP was looking at amendments to and redesign of the plans.

This was followed by an update on the Neighbourhood Development Plan by AD whose report is appended to these minutes.

Public Forum:

VP was asked about which other locations MSDC was investigating to enhance its Land Bank.

Many permissions had been granted in the district but not all enacted upon. Anyone can submit a site but sustainable ones were preferred. A consultation on 'Preferred Options' was due and would have a six week response period. This consultation would assist in the formulation of a land bank plan. Developers preferred green to brownfield sites (cheaper for them to develop as there was no toxic clearance to deal with) but no explanation was forthcoming as to the District Council's support of the use of green sites rather than brownfield.

A definition of 'affordable housing' was sought.

Such housing on a development is a combination of shared ownership in which the householder pays rent on a portion of the property and takes out a mortgage for the balance where further proportions of the rental part can, usually, be purchased and housing association tenancies which can, subsequently be purchased under 'right to buy' legislation. It was stressed that wages in this part of Suffolk are generally insufficient to allow for the purchase of much of the housing proposed for the village.

Would the 'affordable' homes be available to those with a defined link to the village only?

NO. Rentals would be available to anyone, from anywhere, who is on the housing list with sufficient points to be eligible.

What percentage of the developments would be allocated to 'affordable' housing?

35% is the level offered but this cannot be guaranteed.

Why did the Highways mitigation not apply to the proposed Post Mill Lane development?

VP has asked for this to be included in the overall plan and revised Highways Survey.

Has account been taken of the effect of all the extra heavy traffic on New Street that would be generated during the building of the developments at JSR & PML?

This has been considered.

The Highways Survey was completely unsatisfactory and had a more detailed and measured survey been considered such as would take account of traffic movements at different times of day and season?

VP agreed the survey had been unsatisfactory. Should residents so wish the village could undertake its own, more comprehensive, survey and present it to VP for consideration and comparison.

Sustainability was questioned when there are so few employment opportunities in and close to the village (especially considering the forthcoming closure of the chicken factory at Weybread). It was stated that a huge increase in traffic movements was inevitable when the new residents would have to leave the village for work thus having a huge environmental, and possible social, impact. There does not appear to be a sound economic case for these large developments. Although the school could embrace an increase in pupil numbers the surgery was not so well placed as there is no space for expansion of building or car park and it is notoriously difficult for practices in rural areas to attract GPs.

VP stated it was expected the shop and school would flourish

The two smaller developments proposed for the village had encountered difficulties and these were echoed with the two new large proposals. No answers to those problems had been forthcoming then and none were on offer now. What could be offered to the village in terms of improved infrastructure and public transport?

The proposals for Weybread following the closure of the chicken factory meant that there would be more houses and, consequently, more cars but fewer heavy vehicles.

VP was asked to consider restricted access for New Street but this was not generally supported in the room.

It was stated that the developers had great power and combined with government targets meant these types of developments were almost certain to be approved. VP was asked how many planning applications refused by Local Authorities then were granted approval, almost automatically, at appeal?

Not known

It was accepted that agriculture can provide employment but not on the scale required by these development proposals.

Concerns were raised that there were proposals for two new play areas, when there was already one requiring refurbishment/updating in the village, public open spaces when there was an established playing field and myriad footpaths but no apparent provision for the 10s to early teens group.

Something could, perhaps be factored in to the plans

Not putting infrastructure in place prior to the house building on a development was a serious error as trying to make it fit after the development was built was never satisfactory and was often something of a botched job as the developer then had no interest in creating a good, workable plan for a site.

The meeting was advised that all planning and referral meetings at MSDC were open to the public and participation was encouraged within strict parameters

The discussion closed at 20.53hrs

Planning Matters:

Unanimous refusal was recommended for the following applications:

1432/17 application for outline planning permission with all matters reserved for residential development up to 90 dwellings including affordable housing, together with the construction of estate roads and footpaths, drainage, landscaping & the provision of public open space, including children's play space *land west of John Shepherd Road*

1449/17 outline application – residential development (up to 85 dwellings including affordable housing) together with the construction of estate roads and footpaths, drainage, landscaping and the provision of public open space, including children's play space *land off Stradbroke Road, Steer Farm*

Unanimous approval recommended for the following:

DC/18/02329 application for planning permission without compliance of condition(s) *Annex at Tithe Farm, Laxfield Road*

There being no further business the meeting closed at 21.58hrs

**Signed:
Chairman**

19 June 2018

Tuesday 7.30pm June 5th 2018

Welcome

1. Present position

Three proposals + Weybread to be considered jointly in July (?) representations to be made

Consultation on SCC Highways response

Referral Panel from MSDC councillors

2. What has changed since original consideration

Highways deposition

Evidence of Volume/speed/pedestrian mix/vehicle types/scope of assessment of accidents/underreporting of incidents on Jubilee corner & New Street

Weybread proposals

Impact of housing proposals on Fressingfield as a 'hub for Wey', school /Health centre/shop 7 other facilities

Landbank pressures/ development facility following land requests

Ongoing pressure from HMG to increase speedy housing starts/lack of Joint Local Plan/now surplus of land under consideration/management of excess

Health access

Surgery at full, appointments capacity/delays/parking

Drainage/sewerage

Rainwater management/sewerage capacity in the village questioned/survey & action needed prior to any increase in building

3. Increase in FPC's robustness in opposition to proposals

A. MSDC & Planning capacity

- Risks from Red House Farm precedent re market demand/pedestrian safety/adherence to Planning notices
- Adherence to MSDC/NPPF Planning guidance (6/7 houses per year as a 'hinterland village')
- Due regard to MSDC policy of 'Right houses in the right places'

B. Sustainability

The changes have increased the risks of unsustainable development. Scale/house types/lack of provision for employment & services/facilities.

C. Infrastructure

- Uncertainty about CIL capacity to deliver on infrastructure/ incl Health facilities/school improvements/facilities for most groups in the village/ Safe roadway access/pedestrians

Drainage/sewerage. Also public transport & environmental diminishment

D. Safety

- Traffic and roadway management, pedestrians/elderly & children,

E. Localities of proposed developments

- Scale and size of proposals inappropriate for size of existing community, increase on pressure points across village esp. Jubilee corner, New Street & JSR
- All remain rural exception sites so absorbing countryside
- More detailed exploration for smaller, safer localities required

F. Cumulative effects

- The percentage potential increase approaching 100% of core village size
- Exponential pressure from cumulative effects on services/roadways/safety issues

Specific Areas

1. Highways analysis/Assessment
 - a. Too narrow an area surveyed in that fatalities occurred outside village core but still traffic pressures contributory
 - b. Mitigation works – derisory and seriously flawed
 - c. Bypassing suggestions alarming -spreading the problem
 - d. Existing levels of risk before any developments, near misses, underreporting
 - e. Speed assessments/monitoring, villagers experiences & speed limits extension
2. Transport
 - a. Almost complete lack so building bus shelters(?)
 - b. Vehicle types agric/distribution/cars
3. Drainage/Sewerage
 - a. Flooding incidents & sewerage overflow
 - b. A much more precise assessment needed before any increase on the pressure on the system
 - c. Improved rainwater management in the centre of the village
4. Education
 - a. Primary School capacity could quickly be challenged on housing completions if CIL payments in arrears/ ASST Multi academy Trust might work in mitigation.
 - b. High school provision, space at Stradbroke HS but SCC school transport provision uncertain
5. Health provision & access
 - a. Capacity maximum at surgery, appointments and parking indicative.
 - b. Access to additional GP or space in surgery not assured.

Parish Council Actions

- A. to continue to oppose all three proposals in Fressingfield on grounds of sustainability and details above. Oppose Weybread development because of impact on Fress capacity.
- B. Represent these views to Planning Dept Incl. Highways matters
- C. Continue to lobby the District Councillors involved in Referral Panel (July)
- D. Promote and support Fressingfield Neighbourhood Development Plan
- E. Re kindle Drainage/Sewerage/Rainwater management project.
- F. Continue to engage with village groups

GD

Fressingfield Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Update – June 2018

It is important to remember that a Neighbourhood Plan is a document that sets out planning policies to aid and approve planning applications. In this regard, a NDP cannot get a speed limit changed, or solve particular crime issues, but it can aid in getting the right homes and jobs needed in the area, or the provision of utilities.

The meeting held yesterday by the Fressingfield Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group (FNDPSG) was a key meeting, where together we were discussing the Parish of Fressingfield as a whole. What are its Positives and Negatives? What makes Fressingfield unique? As such, we found that things such as the rich heritage and character & how it is a quiet village with a sense of “Neighbourliness” were some strong feelings shared by all. Some negatives that were found were issues along the lines of how we can be isolated due in part to public transport provision, and our ageing facilities that we all use such as telephone and water.

From this, we started to work out areas of knowledge we are missing, such as the types of employment and number of self employed/work from home professionals are situated in our parish. What kind of future will both the young and old have in our Parish? Discussion on areas around the Environment, Housing and Design were considered, and as a Steering Group, we will be testing our statements and assertions at some public events aimed to discover truly what the parish feel about these areas, as well as test if what we have garnered already is a true reflection on Fressingfield. These will be happening in September, most likely the 22nd and 24th in Sancroft Hall. We strongly encourage you all to attend, and there is no wrong answer or incorrect statement. This document is for the entire Parish, and aims to shape it until 2036.

Before these events however, we will be approaching several groups within the Parish, with a goal to not only gain more insight into the issues and opinions of all those that live and work here, but also to ensure that the Policies and conclusions are indeed factual and true.

If any of you, or perhaps a neighbour, would be keen in stepping up and helping us with this task, we would be more than grateful. Any contribution you feel you can give will be more than welcome. Get in contact with me via my PC email or in person and I can pass on your details.

As an update into the future of the plan and its timetable, it can be viewed in full on the Parish Council website, in the Neighbourhood Plan area. After some discussions with Mid Suffolk, we are also not required to complete the sustainability report, saving an additional six weeks worth of time that was accounted for. Along side this, we were successful in gaining funding from Locality to cover the costs of the creation of the Plan, and aim to be completed in October of 2019, where a referendum will be held.

At our next meeting will will hope to have a Vision Statement that the Plan will include. This statement will be derived from all that was discussed at the meeting yesterday.

“By 2036, Fressingfield will be...”