

Minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on the 19 February, 2018 at the Elmsett Methodist Church Hall.

- 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, District Councillor A, Ferguson, County Councillor R Lindsay, the Clerk and 13 members of the public.
- 02.18.01 **APOLOGIES:** No apologies received
- 02.18.02 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST ON AGENDA ITEMS:** There were no declarations.
- 02.18.03 **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING:** The minutes of the Parish Council meetings held on 12 and 19 February were signed as an accurate record.
- 02.18.04 **MATTERS ARISING:** No items not on the agenda.
- 02.18.05 5.1 **COUNTY COUNCILLOR'S REPORT:** Robert updated the meeting on the proposed budget cuts.
- 5.2 **DISTRICT COUNCILLOR'S REPORT:** Alan Ferguson updated the meeting on Babergh matters.
- 02.18.06 **VILLAGE HALL UPDATE:** Chairperson of village hall updated the meeting on progress. They had been pleased with the responses to their recent survey. All policies have now been updated. Meetings have been held with regard to grants and with architects regarding a new build. She also said that there would have to be a lot of fundraising and more volunteers. They were also hoping to have their own website.
- 02.18.07 **NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN UPDATE:** The chairman said that good progress was being made and the questionnaire was being formulated and it is hoped that it will be printed and distributed before the next meeting.
- 02.18.08 **PRESENTATION BY CHARLES COURSE:** Charles informed the meeting that he had been in discussion with Babergh DC regarding proposals to build on Whatfield Road. He said that they would set up their own housing association to manage the properties to let. There would be a mix of type both for sale and rent. He said that drainage would be taken care of and there would be a public open space in the middle. An application would be made within the next month or so.
- He also said that they would be prepared to make a significant contribution to a new village hall.

- 02.18.10 **SPRING CLEAN – in Association with Keep Britain Tidy** – John Sones confirmed that he was arranging for this to be carried out during the weekend of 16-18 March.
- 02.18.11 **TENDER FOR GRASSCUTTING:** Tenders had been received and circulated to all councillors. It was proposed and unanimously agreed to accept the lower tender from Tom Hitchcock, Garden Maintenance..
- 02.18.12 **CORRESPONDENCE:** Note from Shrubland Nursery with regard to their position concerning the planning application at Maltings Farm.
- 02.18.13 **FINANCE:** Appointment of Internal Auditor – the clerk confirmed that Sharon Coram had agreed to do this on our behalf. Following a request from Neighbourhood Watch it was agreed to donate a one-off payment of £50 to the organisation. A cheque for £50.00 was signed for Methodist Church 5 x hirings 2-10,6-11,11-12,12-2 & 19-2, 2018.
- 02.18.14 **PLANNING:** – DC/17/05204 - Land at Shrubland Nursery, Whatfield Road, Elmsett, Ipswich Suffolk IP7 6LZ – up to 18 dwellings – the following comments were forwarded to Babergh DC - We recommend refusal of the application as it represents an overdevelopment for the village where the infrastructure serving the existing community is substandard and overstretched and where there is no identified need for the development.

General Comments

The parish council discussed this application on the 19th February at a very 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 committee in full.

Policy Objection including extracts from Babergh Core Strategy

Your planning policy team has published a joint local plan consultation document. In that document Elmsett is wrongly described as a Core Village. When the evidence spreadsheet is interrogated it can clearly be seen that Elmsett does not attract the 20 points needed to be a Core Village as certain categories are wrongly included. We do not have a daily peak hour bus service to/from a higher category settlement and we do not have allotments. This confirms our position as a Hinterland Village. We would not wish your committee to be swayed by incorrect evidence and will be writing in more detail to your policy team as part of our consultation reply to get this matter corrected.

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 18 plus the approved 7 and recently approved development of 41 would be well in excess of our "fair share".

Equally we should not consider this development on its own we 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- Parish Council)	15/20 dwellings (outline scheme briefed to
Heathpatch Parish Council)	22/42 dwellings (outline scheme briefed to
Others -	?
This development	18
Total could be at least	- 136+ which is getting on for a 40% over 327 existing

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

2.8.5.5 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 are making good progress.

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 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 not in scale with the 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. The approval and subsequent occupation of 18 new dwellings in addition to the existing plant nursery use will lead to road safety dangers on a daily basis over the whole life of the development.

Drainage

Concern was raised at our meeting about the safety and efficiency of the on site lagoon

Highways and Transport

The applicant has provided a Transport Statement that, unsurprisingly concludes that the transport and traffic effects of the proposed development are acceptable. However, that document is seriously flawed and misleading.

Section 3.5 states Vehicular access to the development would be taken directly from the access point on Whatfield Road that will serve the residential units permitted under planning application B/16/00447. The revised central access has not yet been approved.

Section 5.8 this section on the existing highway network states that Elmsett is located at the convergence of several minor roads including Whatfield Road, Hadleigh Road, Ipswich Road and The Street. The report is silent on the real fact that the miles of roads that provides 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 and would not appear on "Crashmap" it is good fortune and there have been no serious collisions but there is no guarantee that the good fortune will continue.

Section 5.9 this section seeks to mislead as there is a fundamental error in that there is no longer (and hasn't been for some time) a daily bus

service to Ipswich, the main employment town and major shopping outlet. There is only one a week, In addition the Monday to Friday bus to Hadleigh leaves at 09:19 and returns at 13:19, it is of no benefit for regular employment use. Anyone living in Elmsett will require their own transport to go to work and therefore it cannot be said that this is a sustainable development.

Section 8 this section attempts to deal with trip generation and uses the TRICS database. Again the data sets used to produce a trip rate for this development is flawed because of the chosen sites. A brief look at the appendix E will inform you that the consultants has chosen surveyed sites on the edge of towns and conurbations, which are not comparable with the highly rural nature of Elmsett and its environs. The days of edge of town survey data sites are in Darlington, Marefield, Braunstone Frith, Speke nr Liverpool, Chapel House Newcastle, Kings Norton Birmingham, West Horsham, Chichester and Aldwick Bognor Regis. Three of these sites have a population of between 250000 to 500000 within 5 miles and 6 of them have car ownership of 0.6 to 1.0 per dwelling. This is just not similar to Elmsett and produces a predictably low vehicular trip rate.

18 new dwellings represents a serious increase in the size of our village and such an increase of housing stock will result in a material increase of traffic on these roads and, because of the nature of the roads will result in a proportionately higher increase in risk.

The last point to reiterate is that there should be no form of street lighting on this site. Should there be any other submissions or comments we reserve the right to comment further.

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 education if all this potential building takes place.

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

When application B/16/00447 erection of 7 no. dwellings and associated works, including the construction of a new vehicular access was approved a section 106 agreement was entered into to table the development to proceed. That agreement provided for 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 Plan to the existing sections of footway near the Hadleigh Road junction. If the 18 units are approved then the 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 the applicant and shown outlined blue on the application plan

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.

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.

Although there are numerous documents supporting this application we could see none that identified the need for the development.

The approval and subsequent occupation of 18 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.

02.18.10 **DATE OF NEXT MEETING:--** 9 April, 2018

The meeting closed

Signed:- Dated:-.....

Chairman