

Minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on the 15 April, 2019 at the Elmsett Methodist Church Hall.

04.19.00 **PRESENT:** Mr A Newman in the chair, Mr Nick Bird, Mrs M Hinton, Mr G Hinton, Mr S Coram, Mr J Sones, Mr A Woodgate, the Clerk and 2 members of the public

04.19.01 **APOLOGIES:** No apologies

04.19.02 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST ON AGENDA ITEMS:** Nick Bird declared an interest under planning – Land north side of The Street – 34 dwellings. The interest book was signed.

04.19.03 **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING:** The minutes of the Parish Council meetings held on 4, 18<sup>th</sup> & 25<sup>th</sup> March were signed as accurate records.

04.19.04 **MATTERS ARISING:** Neighbourhood Plan – The chairman updated the meeting on the progress and that all the necessary documentation had been forwarded to the Examiner following the end of the final public consultation period. It is hoped that the Examiner will be able to report mid-May.

John Sones reported that the spring clean had taken place and a number of residents did areas on alternative dates, although there was a good number on the day. All the equipment had been returned.

04.19.05 **CORRESPONDENCE:** Confirmation had been received that the application for the funding of a Housing Needs Survey has been approved up to a maximum of £4,000 to be paid directly to Community Action Suffolk..

Notification from Suffolk County Council of the schedule of the grass cutting programme for the season. The grass cutting target dates spreadsheet is available from the [grass cutting webpages](#)

04.19.06 **FINANCE:** Cheques were signed as per schedule and verified against invoices

Payee	Sum	Purpose	Powers
HMRC	238.20	Employer's tax	LGA 1972
CPRE	36.00	Annual Subs	LGA 1972
T Hitchcock	60.00	Grasscutting	Open Spaces Act 1906
SALC	342.35	Annual Subs	LGA 1972
Nationwide B/S	10,000.00	Transfer of funds	VH Reserve fund
Bus Servs at CAS	5.21	Additional insurance	LGA 1972

Approval of Accounts prior to Internal Audit – The accounts were approved for Internal Audit on 23rd April.

04.19.07

**PLANNING:** DC/19/01633 Outline Planning Application (some matters reserved) - Erection of up to 34 No dwellings with access from The Street, Elmsett. Land on The North Side of, The Street, Elmsett. Following discussion the following comments were forwarded to Babergh DC - We recommend refusal of the application as it represents a gross overdevelopment for the village where the infrastructure serving the existing community is substandard and overstretched and where, more importantly, **there is no identified need for the further major residential development proposed.**

#### Policy Objection

It should be noted that Elmsett has virtually completed its Neighbourhood Plan and it is currently with the Examiner for final consideration. As stated by your own Planning Policy team, the Plan is a material consideration. This site is not allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan and its approval would undermine the plan-led approach required by the NPPF, adopted by the Parish Council and supported by the District Council.

Your strategic planning policy team published a joint local plan consultation document in August 2017. In that document Elmsett was wrongly described as a Core Village. When the evidence spreadsheet was interrogated it could 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 and this is amplified in our nearly completed Neighbourhood Plan.

**On the 11th April 2019 your Planning Policy team, having considered this application in detail, recommended refusal of the application for a number of reasons.** We endorse all of the comments made by your Senior Policy Strategy Officer.

Furthermore, the proposal is contrary to Policy CS11 of the adopted Babergh Core Strategy in the following respects:

- 1 – Given that over 70 dwellings, including fully policy compliant affordable homes provision, have already been granted planning consent in the village but have yet to commence, there is no evidence of the proven local need as required for hinterland village proposals in Policy CS11.
- 2 – The cumulative impact of the development (if approved) within the Hinterland Village would be unacceptable, particularly on the narrow lanes that link Elmsett to higher order settlements such as Ipswich and Hadleigh.

Further, the proposal is contrary to Policy CS15 i) of the adopted Core Strategy. The proposal would, if approved, have a significant detrimental impact on an important view identified in the Elmsett Neighbourhood Plan, which is currently at the Examination stage. The Neighbourhood Plan Important Views Assessment identifies important views that include the application site (View 12 and View 11) noting that any development in this area could have a significant detrimental impact on this landscape. We consider that the area of Church View has a Valued Landscape over the rolling agricultural land to the Grade 1 listed Building of St Peters Church. It is interesting to note on page 3 of the applicants Design and Access statement that the applicant identifies the same landscape qualities for his development but ignores the harm that the actual development will have on the existing area.

### Recent Planning History

Elmsett is taking more than its fair share of development and you should not consider this development on its own, a more holistic view is needed. Please consider those dwellings recently approved:

Maltings development Whatfield Road - 7 dwellings (planning permission granted), Hadleigh Road - 41 dwellings (planning permission granted) inc 15 Social houses, Maltings Nursery site Whatfield Road - 18 (planning permission granted) inc 6 Social houses, Mill Farm Hadleigh Road - Conversion of 3 barns to 3 residential units (planning permission granted) Other individual application approvals 3 - Total 72

**A recent planning application for 42 dwellings at Whatfield Road (DC/18/02316) was rightly refused planning permission last year because the application failed to adequately demonstrate how the proposal responded to a local identified housing need, contrary to policy CS11 (iv) of the Babergh Core Strategy and paragraph 77 of the NPPF which requires development in rural areas to be responsive to local circumstances and support housing developments that reflect local needs. This application also fails that test and should be refused.**

Our existing housing stock is 327 homes and the 72 additional approvals, which is more than the total proposed in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan, represents a 22% increase on our stretched infrastructure. A further 34 dwellings would represent a 32% increase, which is unsustainable and contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS2 which states that "Hinterland Villages will accommodate some development to help meet the needs within them."

### Highways and Transport

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. 34 new dwellings on top of just those recently approved represents a 32% increase in the size of our village. There is nothing to suggest that an increase of housing stock of 32% will not result in at least 32% more traffic on these roads 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.

There is a Technical Note submitted with the application that seeks to demonstrate that the application is acceptable in traffic and transport terms. We say the note is flawed and demonstrates poverty of thought. The note is flawed because the TRICS base data has, in the main, used sites that have greater population from suburban areas, edge of towns and neighbourhood areas. These sites are stated to be from Peterborough, Macclesfield, Manchester etc, these sites can in no way represent the traffic patterns of Elmsett, a rural village with no commuter public transport. Our traffic generation will be much higher than that suggested. The traffic counts were undertaken when Elmsett was subject to diversions because of the new water main being laid through the village and must be considered to be unreliable and unrepresentative of directional splits. In addition the location chosen to site the automatic traffic counter was on a different road link to the access to the site and as there are two residential accesses apart this means a different pattern and volume of traffic is likely to be revealed. We say there is a poverty of thought because MLM has not considered the surrounding substandard roads that give access and approach to Elmsett merely the site access which is considered to be dangerously close to the school access in any event.

### Flooding

There is a known flooding problem at the school at the south west of the application site where the playground and equipment floods at times of heavy rain (see attached extract from the Government's Flood Warning Information Service). The Floods Team at the County Council are aware of the problem but no action has been taken to date.

### Public Rights of Way

Elmsett FP Number 13 runs along the entire road frontage of the site immediately behind the deep ditch. There is nothing stating how any

diversions will be handled and the feasibility plan shows a garage to plot 29 very close to or on the PROW.

#### Other comments

In our opinion, in the unlikely event that the District Council is minded to approve the application, conditions and/or planning obligations should be included with such an approval to:

- 1 – secure additional land for the school
- 2 – secure passing places on Ipswich Road etc should they have not been delivered by the approval (ref no B/17/01009) at Hadleigh Road
- 3 – Not allow street lights

#### Conclusions

We strongly recommend 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, in addition to all the other recently approved applications, is too large for the capacity of our rural road network and transport infrastructure.

We would like to further address the subject of need. We say that the need to build more houses here has not been demonstrated. Amongst the submitted documents you have received there is no evidence that points to the need to build more houses in this Hinterland Village. In Elmsett we have already got 21 affordable dwellings approved awaiting construction, in addition there are two occupied sites that were approved as rural exception sites and their occupation is restricted to local needs, one of 12 dwellings and the other 8. There is also local authority rentable houses in the village as well. There is clearly no proven need for more additional houses.

We lastly, and possibly most importantly say that approval of this speculative planning application undermines the emerging Elmsett Neighbourhood Plan which is at an advanced stage of its preparation. It is quite possible that the Examiner's Report will have been published before the Planning Committee considers the application. In addition Babergh District Council can now demonstrate a five year housing land supply meaning that you no longer need to approve this type of speculative development in the open countryside that is contrary to adopted policy and outside the Built Up Area Boundary of Elmsett.

04.19.08

**DATES FOR NEXT MEETINGS:** 13 May, Annual Parish Council Meeting, 1<sup>st</sup> July.

The meeting closed

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

Chairman