

BRIGHTWELL, FOXHALL & PURDIS FARM GROUP PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes

of a meeting of the Planning Committee held at Trinity Park, Trinity Rooms on Wednesday, 26th
September 2012

Present

CLlr A Wells - Chairman Planning Committee
CLlr E Warham - Planning Committee
CLlr B Newell - Planning Committee
CLlr E Lawrence - Planning Committee
CLlr A Day – Planning Committee
CLlr G Watts
CLlr B Davies
CLlr J Batham
Mrs A J Buggs – Clerk
40 members of the public
Ms I Lockwood – Bidwells
Mr C Bushby – Trinity Park
Mr S Amann – Transport Consultant Bidwells

1. Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from CLlr Booth, CLlr Smith, CLlr Briggs, CLlr O’Brien and CLlr Falconer.

2. Declaration of interest

CLlr Day declared an interest in Agenda Item 3.

3. Introductions

CLlr Wells asked each member of the Parish Council Planning Committee to introduce themselves to the meeting.

4. Minutes

None

5. The Schedule of Planning Applications

The Planning Committee considered the following applications:

C12/1930 Western Part of Land at Trinity Park and Land at White House Farm, Felixstowe Road, Purdis Farm. Outline Application to enable improvements to Trinity Park to include: Residential development, public open space and associated infrastructure on 8.9HA on the western boundary of Trinity Park. Two roundabouts to serve Trinity Park on the A1156 Felixstowe Road and Relocation of sewage tanks from residential development site to Trinity Park.

6. Discussions

Cllr Wells opened the meeting by outlining some significant points in the application and explained that the meeting had been called to allow members of the public to put their views forward to the Parish Council before they submitted their comments to Suffolk Coastal District Council.

General Discussion

Following a number of questions from the public, Chris Bushby (Trinity Park) confirmed that White House Farm was not included in the development and that Trinity Park is classified as brownfield. This view is based on a recent planning application involving the East of England Showground. The general view of the meeting was that the land was classified as countryside.

The question was asked as to why there is a need to develop the land for housing when there is surplus housing in the area. Chris Bushby (Trinity Park) said that the planning permission is an enabling application. Mr Bushby went on to say that this would set the permanent home of the Suffolk Show and that they were continually investing in the showground.

Bidwells stated that the planning application had been submitted and that as part of that process plans often require amendment and changes. However, it would not be necessary to withdraw the application if amendments were required.

One person expressed the opinion as to why the showground needed to be developed per se. He expressed concern that it appears that local people were resigned to the fact that the development is going to happen.

The view of the people who attended the meeting, except for one person, was that they appeared strongly opposed to the development, specifically the development of additional roundabouts on the A1156.

Sewerage

Trinity Park stated they had their own sewage holding tanks which would be relocated. There is a pumping station on Trinity Park that pumps the sewage into the main system in Bucklesham Road. Anglian Water states that there is more than enough capacity in the system to cope with the increased number of properties.

The question was asked as to whether the Parish Council had any information concerning the problems with sewage in Bucklesham Road. Cllr Warham stated that a meeting had been held with Anglian Water and an operator error had been identified which had resulted in the response times being inadvertently changed. These problems have now been rectified.

Road Access to the Site

The Parish Council confirmed that the new main gate would be Gate 12. A member of the public stated that the map showed the new roundabout to be extremely large; 70 metre diameter. Bidwells stated that the new roundabout was the largest circle which would fit within the junction including the road. Cllr Day asked why there needed to be a roundabout when the traffic seems to flow satisfactorily. A statement was made as to why cause pollution all the year round such as lighting, air and noise when the Suffolk Show was only held for 2 days of the year. Bidwells replied that it was to enable the showground to operate more efficiently. They also stated that they would

be able to use the two roundabouts for the different types of events; outdoor type events and internal conference events. Chris Bushby (Trinity Park) stated that following a meeting which had been held during this afternoon they were going to rethink the road system. Trinity Park owns a piece of land at Straight Road and they were considering moving the roundabout further down the road so that it does not have such an impact on the houses on the Felixstowe Road. It was suggested that the additional roundabout at Gate 10 was unnecessary as the existing Main Entrance could be the access to the new housing development and also the show ground by the addition of a new road within the development which could run parallel to the Felixstowe Road. Cllr Day said that the main issue of the application is the traffic. He felt that residents living opposite Gate 10 believed the traffic had been handled well and they were reasonably happy with Gate 10 being used on show days. Mr Bushby said that two entrances would enable the traffic to be managed more effectively so that there were no queues of traffic. Traffic management would still be required when major events were being held. Opinion was expressed as to why the present Felixstowe Road needed any alteration.

Concern was expressed over the developments in the immediate area by Waitrose and John Lewis and amount of extra traffic which would be generated.

Chris Bushby (Trinity Park) stated that one of the options which have come to the table is whether we could manage with one entrance and this would be investigated.

Schools and Amenities

Concern was expressed that schools in the area are already oversubscribed and in particular primary schools.

Chris Bushby (Trinity Park) stated that such areas as school provision, Broadband and doctors etc are being discussed at the moment. There is normally a contribution by the developers of £1,000,000 per 100 houses to provide education and other provisions. He stated meetings with Suffolk County Council were being held at the moment to consider provisions.

7. Date of next meeting

Wednesday, 10th October 2012

The Chairman closed the meeting at 9.00 pm.

SignedDate

Angie Buggs
Clerk to Brightwell, Foxhall & Purdis Farm Group Parish Council
Telephone: 01473 635341
Mobile: 07770575350
Email: angiebuggs2001@yahoo.co.uk

Appendices

The following are letters / emails which have been received by the Parish Council prior to the meeting being held.

Email from Phil Oliver:

You may recall that I have written to you previously regarding this then proposed planning application.

I am a resident of Felixstowe Road and my property adjoins the showground beside Gate 11. At your previous meeting in June when Bidwells presented their proposal on behalf of SAA I was unable to attend and unfortunately, I am once again unable to attend your meeting on 26th September.

When I wrote previously expressing my views, they were not in favour of what was then being considered. I am glad that Bidwells/SAA appear to have taken on board some of those concerns and that the suggested roundabout beside Gate 11 has been withdrawn.

Although their current application provides details of their review of transport and infrastructure issues, which concludes among other issues that the roads can cope with the extra traffic that 300 new properties will generate, and that there is capacity within the local doctors surgery as they are still taking on new patients, I am not convinced that this is the case. In my previous letter to you I expressed concern at existing difficulties of getting out onto Felixstowe Road (westbound) at busy times and the additional traffic that this development will generate can only make this problem worse. These concerns are unchanged and I am sure that other residents of Felixstowe Road will share the same.

Having also had difficulties recently in getting an appointment to see a doctor at my local surgery, I also remain doubtful that local healthcare providers will be able to give an acceptable service to an increased local population.

Email from Isabel Lockwood Bidwells:

With regards to the Foul Water Sewerage Network, the consultation with Anglian Water was a two staged process. The Utility, Foul and Water Resource Appraisal document includes the following:

1. Pre-development Report from Anglian Water dated 26th January 2012 which at 3.5 stated 'Development will lead to an unacceptable risk of flooding downstream. A drainage strategy will need to be prepared in consultation with Anglian Water to determine mitigation measures.'
2. Developer Impact Assessment Report from Anglian Water dated 14th June 2012. The purpose of the study was to identify a valid point of connection and an appropriate drainage strategy.

This two stage process is common practice with Anglian Water, the Developer Impact Assessment looks at matters in more detail in order to find a resolution to the capacity issues in the network.

Email from Kevin Bye 186 Bucklesham Road:

Our opposition to development of Trinity Park for housing is based on the following points:

- It is an unnecessary and unwanted expansion of housing onto a greenfield site. By Trinity Parks own admission in the supporting documentation, the vast majority of local residents are against this scheme.
- The Trinity Park site is designated as “Countryside” in the current Suffolk Coastal District Local Plan (in Paragraph 13.9). Hence Policy AP8 applies, which restricts development of Countryside areas to that which is essential for the efficient operation of agriculture, forestry and horticulture. Clearly, housing development is not commensurate with this.
- Within the Local Plan, Suffolk Coastal District Council has also designated Suffolk Showground as a zone for recreational activity. There is no good reason to change this. A specific policy has been applied to the Showground within the plan (Policy AP227) This states that “The District Council will encourage the more intensive use of the Suffolk Showground, as shown on the Proposals Map, provided that any permanent new land use proposals for any part of the site are directly associated with recreation and/or tourism”.
- Clare and I support Trinity Parks use for recreational activity and events, but not for building.
- There is no need for housing development on the Trinity Park site when larger developments are still under consideration for sites at Martlesham and Trimley which will meet the needs in terms of house numbers for the foreseeable future.
- Development at Martlesham and Trimley is being considered by a public enquiry, and this inquiry should include all housing development in the area so that we have an integrated strategy for development instead of this piecemeal chipping away at the countryside.
- There is already insufficient capacity at schools in the area for the numbers of children, and they cannot cope with further expansion of housing numbers. No addition to school places is planned for the area.
- Once a precedent for this development is set, it will be impossible to refuse future requests for housing development on the entire Trinity Park site with relocation of Suffolk Showground elsewhere.

Email from Michael Bolton:

I have recently purchased a property at No 129, Bucklesham Road, Ipswich IP3 8UA.

Referring to the outline planning application by Suffolk Agricultural Association for development at Trinity Park in the form of application number C12/1930, I would like to oppose this application on the grounds that I believe that no further development should take place in this area whatsoever. Felixstowe Road has more than enough traffic on it for this semi-rural area already without any further development.

Regarding Bucklesham Road, I notice that the applicant’s agents have stated that they would like pedestrians and vehicles to have access or egress to and from the proposed development site, via Bucklesham Road. I am bound to say that I find the suggestion of this usage of a rural road totally objectionable.

I ask you to reject this application in its entirety.