

Minutes of Elmsett Parish Council meeting held on 12 April, 2022 at the Elmsett and Aldham Village Hall.

- 04.22.00 **PRESENT:** Alan Newman in the chair, Andrew Morton, Nick Bird, Andrew Woodgate, Fiona Watt, Paul Firman, District Councillor L Jamieson, 7 members of the public and the clerk was present.
- 04.22.01 **APOLOGIES:** John Sones (unwell), County Councillor R Lindsay.
- 04.22.02 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST ON AGENDA ITEMS:** Alan Newman declared an interest under planning – Application Nos DC/22/01564 and DC/22/01537 and took no part in the decision making.
- 04.22.03 **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING:** The minutes of the meeting held on 1 March and the planning meeting on 29 March were signed as accurate records.
- 04.22.04 **4.1 COUNTY COUNCILLOR’S REPORT:** This report was circulated and recorded in the Annual Parish Meeting notes.
- 4.2 DISTRICT COUNCILLOR’S REPORT:** This report was circulated and recorded in the Annual Parish Meeting notes.
- 04.22.05 **CHAIRMAN’S REPORT: Footway Whatfield Road-** this is still in progress. **Platinum Jubilee** – The Chairman confirmed that the group organising this event were still working hard to make the day a success. The main event being a street party in the afternoon and a disco in the evening at The Rose and Crown. Notices to go up around the village.
- 04.22.06 **RECESS FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS:** Most of the comments concerned the planning applications. Concerns about the access to the 44 dwellings off Hadleigh Road being opposite residential dwelling.
- 04.22.07 **CORRESPONDENCE:** No further correspondence than items on the agenda.
- 04.22.08 **FINANCE:** The following invoices were verified, and cheques signed
- | | | | |
|------------|--------------------------------|--------|----------|
| SALC | Membership | 363.25 | LGA 1972 |
| HMRC | Emp Tax | 253.00 | LGA 1972 |
| E&A VH | Hire 12-4 | 32.50 | LGA 1972 |
| A Newman | Salary shortfall | 201.22 | LGA 1972 |
| SALC | Payroll Services to 31-3-22 | 22.80 | LGA 1972 |
| SALC | CLlr Training | 62.40 | LGA 1972 |
| A Newman | Reimbursement print cartridge | 27.95 | LGA 1972 |
| A Newman | Reimbursement Coins, Disco QPJ | 445.60 | S137 |
| A Newman | Reimbursement envelopes | 4.55 | LGA 1973 |
| Shrublands | Elm Tree for QPJ | 140.00 | S137 |

The chairman confirmed that the village sign had been dismantled and taken to signwriter to be repainted.

All AGAR documents, S1, S2 and Certificate of Exemption, asset register, bank reconciliations and CIL statements had been circulated prior to the meeting and checked. These were approved and signed the clerk to prepare documentation for internal audit. Clerk also confirmed receipt of the first instalment of the precept of £5,320. Clerk's Salary – It was agreed that the clerk should be awarded the recommended recent national salary increase with effect from 1 April, 2021.

The clerk confirmed that the mandate for the savings account had been updated to include Fiona Watt and Andrew Morton as signatories.

04.22.09 **PLANNING:** DC/22/01754 - Erection of 44No residential dwellings (including 35% affordable housing and bungalows), landscaping and public open space - Land East of, Hadleigh Road, Elmsett – the following comment was sent to Babergh - The Parish Council does not object to the principle of this application for 44 dwellings as this application is in line with Policy EMST3 – Land at Hadleigh Road in the Made Elmsett Neighbourhood Plan. The requirements of EMST3 should be provided in full.

However, as far as the Parish Council is concerned three items still remain unresolved and these are –

1) Parking on Hadleigh Road - We are still very concerned that the approval of this application in its current form will lead to long term highway safety issues. Currently vehicles belonging to or visiting numbers 5 and 6 Hadleigh Road have no alternative other than to park on Hadleigh Road. When the new estate road access is constructed it will be immediately opposite number 6 and parked vehicles at this location will be a real road safety hazard. This situation is in no way the making or fault of the residents who have no off-road parking. All of this was pointed out at the outline stage of the previous application and ignored by the planning committee. Can this now be taken seriously, and some provision made to avert this danger.

2) Frontage Drainage Ditch - A further serious concern is that the approval of the application with a wide and deep frontage ditch will be a hazard for the life of the development. It will be a considerable maintenance burden as can be seen at any roadside ditch in the countryside and will also require a safety fence along the whole of its length between the ditch and the new footpath which in itself will cause further maintenance issues. In addition, there is no facility for pedestrians from Hadleigh Road to join the new footway at the new junction. Finally, it is not clear whether there is a connection between the new ditch and the existing pond at the southwestern extremity of the site, or indeed whether the existing pond remains.

3) Street Lighting - there should be no street lighting on Hadleigh Road or the new estate.

DC/22/01243 - Cross Boundary Application. Creation of a Solar Energy Farm with a solar array together with supporting infrastructure which includes a Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) and associated grid infrastructure and access tracks. (EIA Development) Location: Land South of Tye Lane, Bramford (Part in The Parishes of Flowton and Burstall)

The following response was sent to Babergh - The council was concerned that approval of the application would –

1) Lead to a very considerable loss of good quality agricultural land to the detriment to the landscape and food production. With the UK currently producing less than 20% of its food requirements the arguments to support the loss of prime agricultural land need to be very compelling.

2) Cause road safety dangers on the unclassified road network during the prolonged construction period with heavy vehicles, possible abnormal loads and a considerable increase in workers commuting.

3) Result in the industrialisation of the open countryside and the loss of visual amenity particularly for users of the public right of way network.

4) Create noise pollution through battery and electrical hum (John/Fiona could you enlarge your concerns on this issue)

We were concerned on three additional items.

a) The application is large and fragmented and out of scale and disruption could be caused by cabling operations the detail of which was not obvious. The council considered that decommissioning details should be available prior to permission being granted

b) The council were also mindful that recent figures from the 'Digest of UK Energy Statistics' show that the current UK electricity generating capacity (335TWh) more than meets the total electricity demand (302TWh). Current figures also show that over the last 25 years total energy consumption is decreasing (due to more efficient use of energy, reduction in population growth and the decline in heavy industry).

DC/22/01564 - Residential development for 4No. single storey bungalows, associated garaging with new vehicular access and private drive - Mill Farm , Hadleigh Road, Elmsett. **DC/22/01537** - Erection of 1No dwelling with associated cartlodge and new vehicular access - Mill Farm , Hadleigh Road, Elmsett. Alan Newman left the room and Andrew Morton took the chair – The following response was sent to Babergh –

History It was noted that permission had already been given for three new dwellings that have now been erected immediately adjacent to Mill Farm. Outline planning permission was originally given for the conversion of three agricultural buildings to three small dwellings, this was under Prior Approval Class Q before the Neighbourhood Plan was in place.

Since that time the planning site history has shown several planning applications and considerable incremental growth and each time an increase in the size of the buildings. The detailed planning applications for the three new, now existing dwellings, were submitted separately as an application for two dwellings and a later further application for one dwelling.

These were considered on the basis that all three locations for the proposed dwellings were originally on a 'brownfield' site and were being built over the 'footprints' of former agricultural buildings. Whilst the council did not object to the principle of the three units we were concerned regarding the increase from single storey to 1.5 storey as these were no longer small dwellings

Current Applications The two new current applications are on a 'green field' site falling outside the village Built Up Area Boundary (BUAB) and therefore should be evaluated independently of the previous applications.

In August 2020 the applicant's previous agent (Wincer Kievenaar) approached the Parish Council regarding possible further residential development and asked for their comments. The Parish Council responded setting out the current situation regarding the Elmsett Neighbourhood Plan and that this would come into play regarding their client's site. It was made clear that as part of

the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan an independent assessment was undertaken to look at all the sites put forward earlier by landowners that might be suitable for residential development. The agent was informed that his client's site was included in that assessment but was deemed to be unsuitable and was therefore rejected. He was also informed that his client's site was outside Elmsett's Built Up Area Boundary.

The current applications talk about the 'very positive' response to the design proposal that was received from the Planning Officer at Babergh District Council but have failed to mention that this advice was only for the development in principle and was entirely contingent upon them demonstrating the local housing need for any dwellings. The Planning Officer also encouraged the applicant to discuss their proposals with the Parish Council before making a submission. This was not done.

During the formulation of the Neighbourhood Plan it was clear from the household survey that the village residents did not want unbridled growth and that numbers and locations of development should be controlled.

For any new development proposal, it is important to establish whether or not that proposal complies with the Neighbourhood Plan Policies and the primary considerations that need to be examined when dealing with these two applications are Policies EMST1 and EMST2.

Policy EMST2 - Housing Development states

This Plan provides for around 60 dwellings to be developed in the Neighbourhood Plan area between 2017 and 2036. This growth will be met through:

1 The allocation of sites as identified in separate policies in the Plan and on the Proposals Map

2 Small brownfield "windfall" sites and infill plots of one or two dwellings within the BUAB that come forward in the plan period and are not identified on the plan

As of this date a full allocation of housing has already been met through permissions granted by Babergh District Council. This includes the proposed developments east of Hadleigh Road (41 dwellings) and that at Shrublands Nurseries (18 dwellings).

Therefore, no further sites are currently required.

Policy EMST1 - Spatial Strategy says

The Neighbourhood Plan area will accommodate development commensurate with Elmsett's designation of a Hinterland Village in line with Core Strategy Policy CS11. The focus for new development will be within the defined Built Up Area Boundary as defined on the Proposals Map. Proposals for development located outside the Built-Up Area Boundary (BUAB) will only be permitted where it can be satisfactorily demonstrated that there is an identified local need for the proposal and that it cannot be satisfactorily located within the BUAB/Settlement Boundary.

Conclusions Both sites fall outside the BUAB so would need to satisfactorily demonstrate that there is an identified local housing need for the proposal and

that it cannot be satisfactorily located within the BUAB/Settlement Boundary. No local need for this type of housing has been formerly identified.
Recommendation In consideration of the above comments the Parish Council recommends that you refuse planning permission for the applications.

04.22.10 **DATES FOR NEXT MEETINGS:** 24 May Annual Parish Council Meeting
28 June, 26 July, 13 September, 25 October and 6 December at the village hall.

The meeting closed

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