

TRIMLEY ST MARTIN PARISH COUNCIL

You are hereby summoned to attend the meeting of Trimley St Martin Parish Council **Planning Committee** to be held at the Trimley St Martin Memorial Hall on Tuesday 17 October at 7.30 p.m

Caroline Ley, Parish Clerk
11 October 2017

Trimley St Martin Planning Committee Meeting

AGENDA

1. Apologies for Absence

To receive apologies for absence

2. Declarations of interest and dispensations

2.1 To receive declarations of interest from councillors on items on the agenda

2.2 To receive requests for dispensations for disclosable pecuniary interests (if any)

2.3 To grant any requests for dispensation as appropriate

3. To Confirm the Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 23 August 2017

4. Public Session

Members of the public are welcomed and invited to give their views and to question the Parish Council Planning Committee on issues on the agenda

5. To Agree a Response to the Issues and Options Consultation Document Issued by Suffolk Coastal District Council

The Issues and Options document contains 144 questions. SCDC have invited respondents to comment on as many or few as they wish. The following key questions will be discussed (Page refs in column 2 show where the question appears in the Issues and Options document).

No	Page	Question
2	12	What are the advantages of your area which should be protected through the local plans
6	22	Which of the growth scenarios A,B or C outlined across pages 19 to 21 should be planned for. The growth scenarios are A = baseline, B = medium and C = high. Note that the Ipswich Housing Market Area covers the whole of Babergh, Mid Suffolk, SCDC and Ipswich Borough.
8	22	Would communities be prepared to accept more growth if that meant new or enhanced infrastructure could be provided?
13	32	There are three distribution options for Suffolk Coastal. These are numbered 4,5 and 6 shown on the map on pages 30 to 31. (nos 1,2 and 3 are for Ipswich Borough) Option 4 is a continuation of the existing approach with 27% of housing growth going in on the east of Ipswich, 26% in Felixstowe and the Trimleys and the rest spread out among the market towns and key local service centres. Option 5 focuses 50% of housing growth in and around Ipswich – in an area that stretches to the A12 on its eastern edge. The rest of the growth would then be split with 15% to Felixstowe; 15% to Saxmundham; 8% to Woodbridge and 12% in other towns, villages and rural settlements. Option 6 puts 40% of the growth in and around Ipswich, 19% along the A12 transport corridor, 8% in Woodbridge, 5% in Framlingham; 5% in Leiston; 10% in Felixstowe and 13% in other villages and rural settlements . For the purposes of Options 5 and 6 the Trimley Villages are in the 'other villages' category. Which option would be most appropriate?

17	32	Should the policy approach of maintaining the physical separation of villages from Ipswich be continued or should infill in gaps between settlements be considered as a source of housing land?
32	40	Is there a need for additional educational provision in certain areas of the HMA and if so what is the need and where?
39	46	Is the existing affordable housing policy coverage and scope sufficient? Do you any suggestions for what else might be included in a comprehensive approach to affordable housing?
40	46	Where provision for affordable housing on an exceptional site is supported by, and can be shown to meet the needs of that local community, should planning policy be sufficiently flexible to allow for this?
62	53	Should planning policies take a flexible approach to new employment development where there is an identified need by allowing development outside of allocated sites and physical limits boundaries?
63	53	Should the local plan allocate more land than is required for employment use or should we only allocate what is needed?
89	60	Is the need for and importance of vehicle parking sufficiently reflected in existing planning policies?
90	62	Should we continue to protect all existing community services and facilities?
134	74	Should areas of tranquillity be identified and protected and if so, which areas should be considered?
135	75	In which areas should development be resisted to avoid settlement coalescence?
136	75	Which areas require special protection from development?
143	79	Which sites do you consider appropriate for future consideration by the Council – see schedule below?
144	79	Are there any other sites you are aware of which the Council should consider?

All the sites put forward in the call for sites have been included in the Issues and Options document; those which are situated in Trimley St Martin are listed below. They have **no** formal status as part of the Local Plan and their inclusion does not mean that they are recommended by SCDC for adoption as allocated sites.

Potential Land for Development - Entries for Trimley St Martin extracted from full list					
Site No	Site Address	Area (Hectares)	Proposed Use	Indicative No of Homes	Notes
30	Land NE of High Road	5.9	Housing and open space	118	
356	Land Surrounding Ham's Farmhouse, east of Kirton Rd	92	Mixed	NA	C/From earlier call for sites without check. The land is understood not to be currently being suggested for development
364	Land South 143 Kirton Rd	1.9	Housing (assumed)	37	C/F from earlier call for sites without check. The land is understood not to be currently suggested for development
372	Land North of Heathfields	2.9	Housing	58	
497	Blue Barn Farm	1	Housing	10	
511	Land adj to Reeve Lodge, High Rd	9.8	Mixed	NA	
518	The Old Poultry Farm, High Rd	0.6	Mixed	NA	
651	Land at High Rd	1.6	Self Build Pilot Scheme	33	

706	Innocence Farm,	115.6	Storage or Distribution	NA	
756	Land SW of High Rd	10.2	Housing and Open Space	203	
757	Land South of High Rd	17	Housing and Open space	340	
852	Land Opp Morston Hall, Morston Hall Lane	11.9	Employment	NA	
853	Land at Morston Hall Road and Adj to A14	8.9	Employment	NA	
978	Land Rear of Mill Lane	3	Housing	58	

Close