

EARL SOHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Earl Soham Village Hall

Minutes for ESPC 27/06/18 at 19.00

Attending Chairman David Grose and Councillors, Mark Rutherford, John Starke, Peter Russell, Anna Goymer, Lucy Murrell, Andrew Patterson and Clerk Guy Harvey
Public; 2 members of the public (names held by chair)

DG Opened the meeting at 19.00 and welcomed everyone

1 Apologies: from Neil Warden arrived at 19.30

2 Declaration of interest: from Lucy Murrell

4 Public comment: the following points were raised, firstly little change from first application secondly increase in the number of homes thirdly Brandeston Road will still be used to walk on were there no footpath or lighting fourthly under the local plan it is deemed to be in the countryside and a similar application in Bealings was declined on this basis.

5 DG Opened the discussion by suggesting that we reviewed on the basis of the previous application DC/16/4293/4 and the objections raised at that time
Discussion took place around SCDC DM10 – the site still being used for employment also SP29 were the application recognised that the it was outside the settlement boundary therefore in the countryside in which case under SP27 it would have to prove that the development had a necessity to be there. It was also noted that the affordable homes should be distributed throughout the development. Comment was made that the application was on greenfield and not just brownfield. There was much discussion around the footpath were the application states that the footpath issue was resolved were upon our investigation this was found not to be the case in fact the owner of the land Townland Trust had questions over maintenance insurance lighting bridge and responsibility for build.

Further discussion around the timing of the application and nothing much had changed it would mean significant development in a short space of time and also the Conservation Report were it says Earl Soham is a linear style village were this application is a urban style estate.

The Traffic Movement 1.3.2 and 5.1 used by them was deemed to be misleading, at the time the applicant agreed this was the case and so should be considered to be the same now

DG then took a vote on all items discussed and the following was items was agreed to be objected to by the council.

- i. The application does not comply with SCDC Local Plan 2013 – Local Development Management Policy DM10. The applicant has not clearly demonstrated that there is no current or long term demand for employment on this site.
- ii. The application cannot be considered to comply with SP27d as there are no clusters of building adjacent to the proposed site. Historically Earl Soham has linear residential development and not urban style estate development. This would be an inappropriate development for the village.
- iii. In their planning statement 5.1 it is acknowledged that the site lies outside the current settlement boundary. Therefore, it is considered to be in the countryside. Under the strategic policy SP29 the applicant must show the development has a necessity to be there.

They have not done this. It was noted that application DC/17/4012/FUL was refused on this bases (14th May 2018).

- iv. Boundary issues; a large proportion of the site is not brown field and therefore should not have been included in the design.
- v. Footway link to the village centre – in their planning statement 5.2 it states that the issue of footway link to the village centre has now been address as part of this application. Upon investigation into this the footway link only goes to an existing grass footpath. This path goes through the land owned by the Townsland Trust and there is no agreement in place to upgrading, maintaining and insuring this link and there are 2 contentious issues into lighting and upgrading the bridge to give access to village centre. In the winter this link would be become problematic with increased traffic for buggies, pushchairs, bikes, etc, given this inaccurate statement this should be objected to.
- vi. This application sets a precedent for further planning on land adjacent to this site and could lead to planning creep
- vii. In this application the affordable homes are clearly segregated from the rest of the site. Under SCDC Local Plan 2013 it clearly states that all affordable home should be intermingled with the rest of the housing stock. Also the Suffolk Constabulary report says there are concerns about the design at the front where residents could adopt the front verge and use this for parking which over time could lead to neighbour disputes and anti social behaviour.
- viii. In their planning statement 5.5 they have stated that SCDC can only demonstrate that there is only 3/3.5 years supply and therefore policies under SCDC Local Plan do not apply. However in April 2018 with application DC/17/5380/OUT and application was refused when it was stated that the council has a 7.2 year supply allowing a 5% buffer or 6.2 year supply allowing for a 20% buffer therefore all policies under the SCDC Local Plan, referred to above in this case should be adhered to.

All of the above was voted on by the Parish Council and unanimously objected to this application

6 Next meeting 11/01/18

The Chairman Thanked everyone for their support and coming to the meeting

Meeting closed at 20.20

Signed

Date