Response to SCDC on the Taylor Wimpey planning application for the B&M Concrete site.

This is the output from the K&F PC meeting held on 2\textsuperscript{nd} Feb 2015 and informed by the village meeting on the proposals held on 10\textsuperscript{th} September 2014 and the village meeting discussing the FPAAP held on 27\textsuperscript{th} Jan 2015.

- The Parish Council does not believe that the current proposal is a sustainable development and that it is contrary to the Local Plan.

- Local Service Centre. Kirton is designated a Local Service Centre. Services have not improved since that designation, nor are there signs that they will improve. When originally designated as a Local Service Centre, Kirton was due for a few additional houses at most. The 2013 Local Plan states that larger Key Service Centres may be required to have as many as 30 new homes; Kirton is only a Local Service Centre, yet this development is of a size that the Local Plan states is suitable only for larger Key Service Centres. This proposal is therefore contrary to the 2013 Local Plan, specifically policy SP27.

- The village should not become a housing dormitory with many more houses but no improvements to services, transport or infrastructure. Kirton should not become a dormitory housing estate for Felixstowe; if more housing is required for Felixstowe it should be in Felixstowe, where the services are.

- Housing Mix. The proposed housing mix does not meet the housing needs as identified by the village community. At a meeting attended by 155 villagers, the overwhelming consensus was that the village requires sheltered and affordable housing for the young and elderly, and does not require any more 4/5 bedroom detached houses. In the context of this application ideally sheltered housing should be added to the affordable housing. Certainly the open market element of the housing should have a better mix of numbers of bedrooms and bungalows, suitable for young families and the elderly and complying better with table 3.6 in Local Plan SP3.

- House Height. The houses which are 2.5 stories high will dominate their surroundings, in particular nearby lower level housing in Falkenham Road and Oakdene.

- Design. The local community has the opinion that this is an urban development in a rural setting.

- Ecological Factors. These have not been sufficiently appreciated; the proposal does not adequately address the trees, bats and other wildlife on the site. For example, a barn owl has been observed in the tree line. The view of villagers is that the assessment of trees and the bat survey is substantially flawed.

- Lack of Public Transport. Kirton has no sustainable transport links at present. One of the founding principles of sustainable development is that it should be in the context of sustainable transport links. In this context, this would be an unsustainable development and contrary to Suffolk’s stated goal of becoming “The Greenest County”. Two bus stops exist, but these are poorly served. On Tuesdays and Thursdays there is a single bus to Ipswich in the mornings and there is no service at all on Sundays and holidays. All commuting to work will be by car and almost all shopping will be by car. Distances to local convenience shops is too great for bicycles and it is much too far for any supermarkets. Living in Kirton is almost entirely car dependent and given the multi-car ownership of houses, this proposed development would...
greatly increase traffic flow. If houses were instead located closer to work and services, such as Felixstowe, the availability of public transport would mean fewer cars per household and less traffic.

- Traffic. Falkenham Road is not suitable for the large number of extra vehicle movements inherent in the application. It is narrow with no lighting and no footpath along the majority of its length, it is the route used by children to walk to Trimley St. Martin School and also to walk to bus stops at the green, for travel to the other schools; there is not provision to improve footpaths for these. Other access and solutions for footpaths should be considered. Should the application progress, the developer must be required to fund, deliver and arrange for maintenance of a footpath to Trimley St. Martin School, subject to access arrangements. It should be noted that B&M Concrete moved their access from Falkenham Road to Back Road to alleviate traffic issues. The new access to Falkenham Road for this housing estate will exacerbate traffic issues.

- Street Lighting. Residents are not in favour of increased light pollution. The village would need to be consulted about street lighting, since this would be at odds with the views of the majority of the village.

- Sewage. The sewerage system cannot cope with the current level of housing at Kirton and Bucklesham. It often overflows at high pressure along Bucklesham Road and streams of sewage can be seen near the church. If Anglian Water state that the current infrastructure can cope with the development then they are mistaken, and cannot have used the available information on blockages and overflow. On a detailed point it is not clear how the sewerage will be connected. It is believed that a sewerage access pipe would pass by houses with septic tanks, which are assumed to have been implemented for a reason.

- Surface Drainage. The developer appears to have recognised that the site has a current problem with flooding and water logging; it also used to have a pond on the site. Part of the developer’s solution appears to rely upon ditches to which the developer has no right of access to ensure flow and so cannot guarantee surface water drainage. This is of great concern to those neighbouring the site. The Parish Council view is that this is a major issue and that the proposed solution, relying on ditches to remove a major volume of water, may well fail and cause flooding, and so the Parish Council challenges Taylor Wimpey’s statement, on the application form, that the development will not cause flood risk elsewhere. We believe that Taylor Wimpey has not so far put forward a workable solution to surface drainage.

- Disturbance. Villagers’ report noise and dust pollution from B&M Concrete. B&M Concrete will move their operations to an adjacent locality and will continue to operate. Has the affect of the noise and dust from B&M Concrete on the proposed development been taken into account? The Parish Council does not believe that the proposed 2.5m acoustic barrier to the south of the development is an appropriate solution to the noise issue in the middle of a rural village.

- Maintenance. The Parish Council is extremely concerned about the proposed non-adoption of infrastructure. The experience of the village of non-adoption of roads, drains and amenity land has been very poor; for example amenity land has been sold off in the past by management companies at Meadowlands. It also creates additional maintenance charge on top of rates for house owners. If the infrastructure is not adopted, then the Parish Council ends up being the focus of dispute resolution between management companies and residents. If SCDC were to approve this development, then SCDC and Highways must adopt common land and roads.
• The Parish Council is aware of the significant archaeological features in the area within and surrounding the village. The Parish Council supports the recommendation in the application for an evaluation as a planning condition and suggests that a survey and an excavation assessment is made, prior to any development ground works.

• This application states that there is no public right of way through the development. Yet the developer proposes that the development will provide access to new and existing village residents, in particular relating to the proposed new footpath to the school. This appears to contradict the statement made by Taylor Wimpey on the application form.

• A previous application for this site was rejected; C89/0264. SCDC turned this application down for traffic, infrastructure and domination of existing housing reasons; as the points above demonstrate, these issues still exist and some are now much worse than in 1989. Ironically, this earlier application was for sheltered housing and bungalows, which the village requires.