

## **TRIMLEY ST MARTIN PARISH COUNCIL**

Minutes of the meeting of Trimley St Martin Parish Council **Planning Committee** held at the Trimley St Martin Memorial Hall on Tuesday 22<sup>nd</sup> November at 7.30 p.m.

### **Minutes**

Present: Councillors Sills, Parker, Garrett and Pither. Also present: 9 members of the public and Councillor Barker

### **Public Session**

Members of the public expressed their concern about the impact of the Network Rail proposals in particular the loss of amenity arising from the reduction in the number of crossings which would reduce access for equestrians and walkers, and the potential dangers for riders inherent in using a bridleway bridge of the design proposed. The visual impact of the bridge was highlighted as a major concern as was the potential for noise and air pollution arising from trains idling in the loop.

### **Planning Committee Meeting**

#### **1. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor Owen

#### **2. To Receive Declarations of Interests**

No member of the Committee declared any interests in matters on the agenda.

#### **3. To Receive and Determine Requests for Dispensations**

There were no requests for dispensations.

#### **4. To Confirm the Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 1st August 2016**

The meeting of the Planning Committee held on 1st August 2016 were agreed and signed as a true record.

#### **5. To consider and agree a response to the consultation by the Secretary of State for Transport on the request by Network Rail for an opinion on whether their Scoping Report forms a satisfactory basis for an environmental impact assessment and, if not, what further or different information would need to be included.**

The Committee considered the Scoping Report as a basis for an environmental impact assessment and agreed their response as follows:

##### **Omissions**

- Failure to address the significant visual impact on users of the bridge which would not be mitigated by screening.
- Failure to address the potential deterrent effect of the bridge on equestrians and the impact on riders of using the main road as an alternative.

- Failure to address the impact on residents of the new housing development at Cavendish Grove, Trimley St Martin of the proposed temporary access road and service yard adjacent to the development.

The significant impact on residents living near to the loop and also on walkers and riders in the area from the noise generated by trains idling in the loop fell outside the terms of the scoping report but was identified for inclusion in the response to ensure that it was not overlooked.

## **6. To Consider and Agree a response to the consultation by Network Rail on the Proposed Network Rail (Felixstowe Branch Line Improvements) Order**

The Committee objected to the proposals and agreed that the following points would be included in their response:

- Although this proposal related to the construction of the bridge, the closure of level crossings and changes to the public rights of way and did not touch on the Trimley loop work, many of the problems associated with it related to the proposed location of the loop within the context of the wider permissions secured in 2008. Were the loop to be located further along the line towards Ipswich the aim of increasing capacity on the Branch Line could be achieved with a much diminished impact on local residents and leisure users.
- The proposed position of the single passing place would have a significant impact on local residents who would be severely affected by the noise and air pollution associated with trains idling in the loop for lengthy periods.
- The plan to close six level crossings was considered to represent a significant loss of amenity for local residents. The crossings were used by walkers and equestrians and the proposed bridge was not considered to be an adequate or appropriate alternative. The St Martins crossing, Trimley Footpath and Grimston Lane Crossing were considered to be the least used of the six, but the remaining three were of considerable importance to the community.
- The Gun Lane Bridge was considered unsuited to its purpose. The equestrian community regarded it as being unsafe for horses and riders as the proposal failed to address the needs of any but the most docile of horses. In consequence of this the plans would deprive most equestrian users of a crossing with the result that riders would be forced to make use of the main road with all its attendant dangers. It was noted that general guidance issued by the British Horse Society had been considered by Network Rail however an appropriate additional step would be to seek the views of the local representative of the British Horse Association in relation to the proposals as they related to the specific location.
- The proposed bridge was in a quiet rural area on the border of an area of outstanding natural beauty. The addition of a large, unsightly metal structure would greatly detract from the beauty of the area. In the fullness of time tree

planting would screen it from view from some angles, but screening could never address the significant visual impact on users of the bridge which could not be mitigated by the passage of time.

- Were it to prove impossible to reposition the loop to a more suitable location an underpass would be a preferable means of achieving a crossing thereby reducing visual impact to a minimum and facilitating crossing by pedestrians, equestrians and farm traffic.
- The plans did not acknowledge the existence of the new housing development at Cavendish Grove. The proposed temporary access road from the Trimley roundabout was intended to run alongside the new development. During the construction phase residents of the new development would be adversely affected by noise, passing HGVs, and other impacts associated with the presence of a service yard adjacent to their properties.

**7. To Consider a Response to The District Council in Relation to the Proposed Removal of the BT Pay Phone at the junction of Old Kirton Road and Cavendish Road**

The Committee considered the proposal and had no objection to it. The Committee were not would be interesting in adopting the call box to use for another purpose.

**8. The meeting closed at 8.55p.m.**