

TRIMLEY ST MARTIN PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting of Trimley St Martin Parish Council **Planning Committee** held at the Trimley St Martin Memorial Hall on Wednesday 13 November 2019 at 6.30 p.m.

Present: Cllrs Anderson, D'arville, Parker (chairman), Rastrick, Smart and Southworth

Also Present:

- Sarah Lyons and John McKee of Flagship Housing Association
- Members of the public

1. Apologies for Absence

No apologies for absence had been received.

2. Declarations of interest and dispensations

No declarations of interest on items on the agenda were made and thus there were no requests for dispensations.

3. To Confirm the Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 30 January 2019

The minutes of the meeting held on 30 January 2019 were agreed and signed as a true record.

4. Public Session

b) It was agreed that questions from members of the public could be addressed to Mrs Lyons and Mr McKee after the presentation or when a suitable break point arose.

5. To Receive a Presentation from Representatives of Flagship Housing

- a) Sarah Lyons, project manager of Flagship Housing, addressed the meeting about the development of the site between Seamark Nunn and Mill Lane.
- b) Flagship had applied to make some small changes to the planning approval which had been secured for 69 dwellings by Pigeon Developments, but the paths and open spaces on the site remained the same. Final approval of their revisions was expected to be received any day. In particular some of the larger units had been reduced in size from what had originally been planned so as to more closely reflect their preferred housing type. The next stage would be to follow a tendering process in order to select a building firm to undertake the construction. It was hoped that this stage would be completed by February 2020. It was expected that there would be work going on on site from March 2020
- c) The build was planned to take 18 months. The Section 106 agreement required that the construction process be conducted in phases and these were of different lengths.
- d) Phases 1 and 2 each included affordable housing and some open market housing units with a requirement that the affordable housing be handed over before stage 3 of the development (all open market properties) could be proceeded with. The builder's traffic management plan would need to take account of the fact that the Phase 1 and 2 properties would be occupied while phase 3 was under construction. The majority of the affordable dwellings would be for rent, but five dwellings would be offered on a shared ownership basis. A copy of the phasing programme would be supplied to the Clerk.
- e) In answer to questions Ms Lyons confirmed that all no dwellings would exceed two storeys and none would front onto the High Rd. Parking space would be provided in line with the requirements of East Suffolk Council. Some, but not all, of the houses for private sale would have garages but no garages would be provided to the affordable dwellings. All the roads would be built to Highways adoptable standards however

SCC Highways would only adopt the infrastructure at the entrance to the development. Flagship would set up a management company which would be responsible for the rest. If the residents were not satisfied with the management company it would be open to them to establish their own after a set period. There would be a set collection point for bins which would not be on the High Road. The sizes of the gardens varied between properties; there was no minimum or maximum standard which applied to garden size.

- f) Drainage arrangements were calculated by civil engineers. The fundamental requirement was to ensure that the site itself would not flood nor would it cause any other site to flood. The arrangements which would be made included a storm water attenuation pond which would not be lined or fenced. Concern was expressed about child safety on those occasions when the weather conditions meant that it temporarily filled with water
- g) The dwellings would be built to meet existing environmental building standards, but they had not been designed to incorporate enhanced standards. Ms Lyons would check whether some houses would have solar panels. Members commented that it was disappointing that more was not being done to address the need going forward for sustainable construction.
- h) The working name for the development was "The Lilacs". Members commented that this did not reflect any existing or past characteristic of the site and the hope was expressed that it would be possible to agree a more suitable name through East Suffolk District Council.
- i) In response to the point that Mill Close was not suitable for contractor parking, Ms Lyons explained that Flagship would work with the chosen contractor to ensure that their traffic management plan addressed issues such as site parking and the location of site facilities.
- j) The public footpath which runs down the side of the development into Mill Close would be separated from the development by fencing. Flagship had met with the Allotments Committee to discuss the path giving access to the allotments at the south eastern corner of the development site and agreed that this would be transferred to allotment committee
- k) All the highways requirements contained in the s106 agreement would be adhered to. Ms Lyons said that Flagship would give consideration to funding the replacement of the existing 30 mph speed sign with a mantelpiece style sign (one incorporating the speed limit, a welcome to Trimley St Martin and a request to drive carefully) but they would need to have information on the cost involved before they could make any decision.

6. Close

The meeting closed at 7.15 pm.