

Minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on the 11 June at the Elmsett Methodist Church Hall.

**PRESENT:** Mr Nick Bird in the chair, Mrs M Hinton, Mr G Hinton, Mr S Coram, Mr J Sones, Mr A Woodgate, District Councillor A, Ferguson, County Councillor R Lindsay, the Clerk and 8 members of the public

06.18.01 **APOLOGIES:** Mr A Newman

06.18.02 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST ON AGENDA ITEMS:** Cllr Nick Bird declared an interest under planning at Elmsett Hall and signed the interest book.

06.18.03 **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING:** The minutes of the Parish Council meetings held on 14 & 29 May were signed as accurate records.

06.18.04 **MATTERS ARISING:** The chairman confirmed that Anglian Water are making good progress with the work of renewing the main water pipe through the village.

06.18.05 5.1 **COUNTY COUNCILLOR'S REPORT:** Robert updated the meeting on County council matters – 1. Cabinet set to approve school bus cuts despite overwhelming opposition. 2. The new leader is introducing Policy Development Panels with the removal of Cabinet Committees, which were only established in September 2017. 3. Unitary discussions are on hold. He then answered questions regarding potholes and verge cutting. Members of the parish council were concerned about the worsening of the potholes at the junction of Ipswich Road and Gate Farm, especially now that most of the traffic from the village uses this route as Anglian Water has road closures on Hadleigh Road. He also said that he would look into the verge cutting which appeared to be behind schedule.

5.2 **DISTRICT COUNCILLOR'S REPORT:** Alan Ferguson updated the meeting on Babergh matters. **Free Parking** A motion will be presented to the Babergh Cabinet in December 18. **Public Access** there will be an access point (of some sort) in Hadleigh following the move to Ipswich. **Private Sector Housing** The redraft of the new Local Plan is expected to go before the Cabinet this month proposals are now in the pipeline to review the 5-year housing supply every 6 months. **Merger of Babergh & MSDCs** – this is now on hold. **Disposal of Corks Lane Buildings** - The project will be considered by the full Babergh Council in June 18 and then go before the full Planning Committee in September 18. To sell or develop? That is the question. **A Vision for Sudbury** The Cabinet approved a paper called delivering a Vision for Prosperity in Sudbury. MS have done it for Stowmarket and I would like to see a similar exercise completed for Hadleigh. **Communication** He then went on to report their failure to “get the message over” to the electorate (good or bad) has been a concern of his for the last 3 years. He is

pleased to note that the Leader of Babergh DC and his Deputy are now doing “meet the people” Q & A events to try to bridge this gap. The first was held in Sudbury a couple of weeks ago and the most recent was conducted in the Hadleigh Town Hall, on Saturday 9<sup>th</sup> June 18.

Attendance was disappointing but that’s probably a reflection of the need to let voters (not just in Hadleigh & Sudbury) know that these events are taking place. A new Cabinet Member has been appointed with sole responsibility for “communication” in Babergh District.

- 06.18.06 **VILLAGE HALL UPDATE:** Chairperson of village hall updated the meeting on progress. An architect was doing a feasibility study on the hall and presenting their findings at the next meeting of the village hall. The chairman thanked the village hall reps for the work they were doing and looked forward to hearing the results.
- 06.18.07 **NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN UPDATE:** Andrew Woodgate updated the meeting and said that the results of the survey were being analysed and he was preparing a piece for the newsletter. Progress is being made on producing the first draft of the plan.
- 06.18.08 **RECESS FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS:** Members of the public expressed their views regarding the planning application on the agenda at Whatfield Road. Whilst some felt that affordable housing is necessary others said that the infrastructure, etc is a major issue. Drainage was a big concern as well as the need for a footpath.
- 06.18.09 **CORRESPONDENCE:** 1. James Buckle has invited residents for a tractor and trailer ride round his farm on 4 July – the clerk to put the matter in the newsletter, noticeboard and website. 2. Police Forum 13 June, Shotley Village Hall, John Sones is unable to attend. 3. Babergh Area Meeting 18 June, Hadleigh Leisure Centre 7pm.
- 06.18.10 **FINANCE:** The clerk confirmed that a sum of £8,993.00 had been received to enable the completion of the Neighbourhood Plan. Purchase of equipment for meadow in conjunction with the school – as there still appeared to be confusion over what was required, it was agreed to seek further clarification and discuss at the next meeting. Provision of appropriate benches/seating around the village – Following a discussion it was felt that whilst the parish council supported this in principle, no suitable locations were identified at the meeting and it was decided to further investigate and report back at the next meeting for discussion. Cheques were signed for A Newman £52.00 reimbursement of gift for internal auditor. Village Hall MC £750 – 50% of the cost of cutting the Rectory Meadow for the year.
- 06.18.11 **PLANNING: DC 18/02316 – 42 dwellings Southside of Whatfield Road.** It was noted that the site area used for the ecological survey was incorrect and should be referred to in the comments to Babergh. It was agreed to object to the proposals - **Summary of Recommendation**

We recommend refusal of the application as it represents a gross overdevelopment for the village where the infrastructure serving the existing community is severely substandard and overstretched and where, more importantly there is no identified need for the residential development proposed.

**General Comments** The parish council discussed this application on the 11th June at a well attended public meeting. The general feeling was that the application was far too large for the village and that Babergh Planning Control is now out of control, focusing on approving residential development to the exclusion of any thought or consideration of scale, location, infrastructure, or material harm caused. Will you please ensure that our comments are presented to the planning committee in full. We also request a properly organised committee site visit this time including full exploration of the road network that serves the village prior to the application being considered.

**Policy Objection including extracts from Babergh Core Strategy**

Your planning policy team has published a joint local plan consultation document. In that document Elmsett was wrongly described as a Core Village. When the evidence spreadsheet is interrogated it can clearly be seen that Elmsett does not attract the points needed to be a Core Village as certain categories were wrongly included. Your policy team has now agreed that Elmsett is a Hinterland Village.

When considering planning applications there is a need to consider how the application sits within the planning policies that pertain. Babergh Core Strategy and Policies 2011-2031 should be your guidance until your new plan is adopted. Reference to Section 2, the Strategy for Growth reveals that your own adopted strategy includes Elmsett as a Hinterland Village

*Policy CS2: Settlement Pattern Policy*

*The development strategy for Babergh is planned to a time horizon of 2031. Most new development (including employment, housing, and retail, etc.) in Babergh will be directed sequentially to the towns / urban areas, and to the Core Villages and Hinterland Villages identified below. In all cases the scale and location of development will depend upon the local housing need, the role of settlements as employment providers and retail/service centres, the capacity of existing physical and social infrastructure to meet forecast demands and the provision of new / enhanced infrastructure, as well as having regard to environmental constraints and the views of local communities as expressed in parish / community / neighbourhood plan*

within the Core Strategy there is a section (CS3) which outlines the planned "Distribution of Growth" in Babergh. In the 20 years 2011 - 2031. This states that the plan is for 1050 dwellings in the Core and Hinterland villages, of which there are 10 and 43 respectively. Although it

would be incorrect to say there should be an equal division between each, because most should go to the Core villages, if this were done this would equate to 20 dwellings. Thus this development of 42 plus the approved 7 and recently approved development of 41 to say nothing of the application for 18 at the Maltings Nursery would be well in excess of your own policy and far more than our "fair share".

Equally you should not consider this development on its own as you need to take a more holistic view. That is to say, those dwellings already built within the timeframe, and those of which we have knowledge going forward:

Church View	-	8 dwellings (completed)
Maltings development	-	7 dwellings (planning permission granted)
Hadleigh Road	-	41 dwellings (planning approved but not yet issued)
Fisons The Street to Parish Council)	-	15/20 dwellings (outline scheme briefed)
Heathpatch	-	42 dwellings (this application now submitted)
Others	-	?
Maltings Nursery site	-	18 (application submitted)

Total could be at least - **136+ which equates to an increase of more than 40% of the 327 homes existing housing stock and is unsustainable.**

In addition there is also at least one obvious "Brownfield Site" that might yield at least 10 dwellings that is yet to come forward.

The core strategy says ... *Hinterland Villages will accommodate some development to help meet the needs within them. All proposals will be assessed against Policy CS11. Site allocations to meet housing and employment needs may be made in the Site Allocations document where circumstances suggest this approach may be necessary.*

### 2.8.5 Core and Hinterland Villages

*2.8.5. In all cases and of paramount importance will be to ensure that overall development throughout the plan period, in any settlement, is in scale with that settlement.*

*2.8.5.6 It will also be important to ensure that any development in the Core and Hinterland Villages is supported by an appropriate level of infrastructure. As with the larger strategic sites, provision of adequate infrastructure to serve developments will be required. .... In considering the cumulative impact, the findings from monitoring the impacts of previous planning applications in respect of the social, physical and environmental impacts and the effects on quality of life within the village will be considered and reflected in the assessment of new proposal*

*Policy CS11: Strategy for Development for Core and Hinterland Villages*

*Development in Hinterland Villages will be approved where proposals are able to demonstrate a close functional relationship to the existing settlement on sites where the relevant issues listed above are addressed to the satisfaction of the local planning authority (or other decision maker) and where the proposed development:*

*i) is well designed and appropriate in size / scale, layout and character to its setting and to the village;*

*ii) is adjacent or well related to the existing pattern of development for that settlement;*

*iii) meets a proven local need, such as affordable housing or targeted market housing identified in an adopted community local plan / neighbourhood plan;*

*iv) supports local services and/or creates or expands employment opportunities; and*

*v) does not compromise the delivery of permitted or identified schemes in adopted community / village local plans within the same functional cluster.*

*The cumulative impact of development both within the Hinterland Village in which the development is proposed and within the functional cluster of villages in which it is located will be a material consideration when assessing such proposals.*

*All proposals for development in Hinterland Villages must demonstrate how they meet the criteria list above.*

It should be noted that Elmsett has commenced work on a Neighbourhood Plan and is making good progress. Our household survey indicates that the vast majority of residents are happy to have some development over the plan period BUT they are very clear that the total in the plan period should be less than 50 new homes and they have already been approved.

We cannot see how this development complies with any of your core strategy policies for hinterland villages. There is scepticism in the village about the planning process in that with the failure of Babergh to maintain a 5 year housing supply you are willing to disregard written policy and accept any opportunistic development which does not meet the needs of the local population.

We still say that this proposed development should be refused because it is not sustainable, is certainly not in scale with the existing settlement, it does not comply with any of the core strategy policies and it is far too large for the capacity of our rural road network and transport infrastructure and there is no proven need. The approval and subsequent occupation of a further 42 new dwellings in addition to those already approved will lead to real road safety dangers on a daily basis over the whole life of the development.

**Strategy for Growth 2.2.2.3** If the amount of growth planned for Babergh was to be divided equally across all towns and villages in the district over the plan period, many small settlements would be overwhelmed putting pressure on the infrastructure, services and facilities. This would lead to an increase in commuting by car and other vehicle movements, and would stretch service provision (schools, health

etc) at a time when services are being cut back. Not only would this be unsustainable, but it would also be contrary to the views and aspirations of the majority of communities in the district. The preferred approach is to plan for growth to be distributed to the towns with some town-edge / urban expansion in Sudbury, Hadleigh and the Babergh Ipswich Fringe and to Core and Hinterland Villages at a scale appropriate to the locality.

**Highways and Transport** There is no highway or transport assessment submitted with this application to support or justify its approval.

The roads that provide access to Elmsett are narrow, single track in places and often have long distances between passing bays without intervisibility. There are frequent near collisions and some collisions, thankfully these are mostly non injury and therefore not reported. However, that is down to good fortune and there is no guarantee that the good fortune will continue. 42 new dwellings on top of just those recently approved at Hadleigh Road and those still under consideration at the malting nursery site represents a 35% increase in the size of our village. There is nothing to suggest that an increase of housing stock of 35% will not result in at least 35% more traffic on these roads, 35% greater population and, because of the nature of the roads this will certainly result in a proportionately higher increase in risk and increase the number of accidents. Please do not impose this additional and unnecessary load and risk on our village and road network.

**Flooding** Residents confirmed that in times of heavy rain flooding still occurs in Whatfield Road and their gardens. Unless this is properly considered and dealt with the additional run off will worsen this situation.

**Education** Whilst we may satisfy ourselves that Suffolk County Council will obtain the funding for the estimated increase in children for the development we support some of Elmsett residents' concerns of pressure on existing education places if all this potential building takes place.

**Ecological Study** The ecological survey states the site is approx. 1.03 ha. (This may have been the originally proposed site) The indicative site layout now extends to be 2.552 ha so the ecological survey should be extended to match the new site area. We also note that the contaminated land assessment requires an area of 5.29 ha.

**Detail Highway Considerations should the District Council be minded to set aside our objection and approve the application that should become recommended conditions**

A continuous footway must be provided along the south side of Whatfield Road from the site to the existing footways at the junction of Whatfield Road, Hadleigh Road and The Street.

When application B/16/00447 erection of 7 no. dwellings and associated works, including the construction of a new vehicular access was approved and a

section 106 agreement was entered into to enable the development to proceed. That agreement provided for a contribution being conditional upon the development being commenced and required the applicant to make a highway contribution in the sum of £26,000 and for the highway authority to use the Highway Contribution towards the provision of a footway from the pond as identified on the Agreement Plan to the existing sections of footway near the Hadleigh Road junction. We also requested that if the 18 units at the Maltings Nursery were approved then that applicant should enter a further S106 to provide such contributions that are needed to provide the missing footway link over the pond on land owned by that applicant. We have heard nothing more of those footway schemes and as time goes on the likelihood of £26000 being insufficient to provide the scheme must be greater. This application provides another section of footway across the site frontage and to link to that section in front of the Maltings development site. This application should not be approved without the guarantee that the whole footway from the site to Hadleigh Road being provided in its entirety.

### **There should be no road or footway lighting on the site**

Because of the number of additional HGV's and builders traffic that will be generated by the construction of these dwellings and on the road network, to say nothing of the provision of utility services we recommend that there should be a properly considered construction management plan that should be adhered to with penalties for breaches.

**Broadband.** Should it be included in the S106 as previously suggested by SCC. The development should be equipped with high speed broadband (fibre optic). This facilitates home working which has associated benefits for the transport network and also contributes to social inclusion, it also impacts educational attainment and social wellbeing, as well as impacting property prices and saleability. As a minimum, access line speeds should be greater than 30Mbps, using a fibre based broadband solution, rather than exchange based ADSL, ADSL2+ or exchange only connections.

**Conclusions** We say that this proposed development should be refused because it is simply not sustainable, is not in scale with the settlement, it does not comply with any of the core strategy policies and it is too large for the capacity of our rural road network and transport infrastructure.

What has recently been approved and planned is contrary to the whole strategy for growth. The increase in cars will be inevitable, not only from our developments, but from those in Aldham (7 approved) and Whatfield (Church Farm built (not all sold) and there is a public consultation next week for a potential build of 18 at Whatfield.

We have a very poor bus service – car is the only option in addition there is little employment – therefore need to drive to work

All of this affects not just Elmsett, but adjoining villages – Burstall, Aldham and Whatfield

And yet again there is a failure to meet CS 11. Where is the proven local need – currently 7 dwellings for sale in Elmsett (2 – 6 bed) (£125k - £600k) – little movement over the past few months.

Although there are numerous documents submitted with this application there is no transport assessment and we could see none that identified the need for the development.

The early results of our emerging Neighbourhood Plan and your own policies indicates that no new applications should be approved in the village. This is a speculative application, it is not an allocated site and it should be refused.

The approval and subsequent occupation of 42 new dwellings will lead to road safety dangers on a daily basis over the life of the development. The parish council requests that prior to consideration in committee that there be an accompanied site inspection by all the planning committee that will, importantly, include a proper detail tour of the road network serving Elmsett.

**DC/19/02319 – Erection of shed to house biomass boiler, Elmsett Hall, Offton Road.** Nick Bird declared an interest and left the room. Stan Coram took the chair. The parish council could see no reason to object to the proposal.

06.18.12 **DATE OF NEXT MEETING:-** 23 July, 2018.

The meeting closed

Signed:- ..... Dated:-.....

Chairman