



Waldringfield

Parish Council

Parish Clerk: David Lines
43 Fourth Avenue, Frinton-on-Sea,
Essex CO13 9DY
E: pc.waldringfield@googlemail.com
T: 01255 678888 (with voicemail)
www.waldringfield.onesuffolk.net/parishcouncil

1701

Minutes of the Extraordinary Parish Council Meeting held on Tuesday 1st May 2018

Present: Councillors Kay, Videlo, Matheson, Elliot, Reid

- 1 **APOLOGIES AND APPROVAL FOR ABSENCE OF PARISH COUNCILLORS** Apologies for absence received from Cllrs. Gold and Archer and also from David Lines (Parish Clerk)
- 2 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST** – *Item 5(a) Homewaters Cllr Reid (non-pecuniary) Item 5 (b) Gorselands Cllr Kay (pecuniary) – Cllr Kay withdrew for the entire discussion of this item for which the chair was taken by Cllr Videlo.*
To **RECEIVE** delegated Declaration of Interest Dispensation decisions or **APPROVE** such dispensation requests as needed – **NONE**
- 3 It was **RESOLVED TO ADOPT** the minutes of the extraordinary Parish Council Meeting held on 10th April 2018 - proposed by Cllr. Kay, seconded by Cllr. Elliot. **AGREED** by all present at the meeting.
- 4 **Matters for REPORT and REVIEW of ACTION POINTS** from the minutes of previous meetings: it was agreed to defer these until the next meeting.
- 5 To **CONSIDER** Planning Applications for **COMMENTS** (including those received after publication of this agenda) and to **NOTE** any application decisions:
DC/181441/FUL Homewaters Cliff Rd Demolition of rear single story extension with erection of larger extension and internal alterations. The Council resolved unanimously to make no objection to this application. Proposed by Cllr Elliot and seconded by Cllr Reid.
DC/18/0439/OUT Gorselands Newbourne Road - 18 houses, access road, lake and perimeter woodland. The acting chair invited comments from members of the public after which Cllr Elliot delivered the report of the planning group. It was then unanimously resolved by the council to **OBJECT** to this application and to recommend that it be refused permission, proposed by Cllr Reid and seconded by Cllr Matheson. Cllr Elliot agreed to amend the grounds for objection adding additional points that had been made (including the lack of regular public transport, the lack of mains water and of fire hydrants, the threat to wild life, and allegations about commercial waste being buried and burnt on the site) and to circulate the revised draft to councillors for final detailed agreement (**attached**).
To **MAKE ARRANGEMENTS** to deal with applications received after the agenda's publication. It was agreed that these could be dealt with in timely fashion at the next meeting of the Council.
To **NOTE** any application decisions (including those after publication of this agenda)
DC/18/1445/AME Rockhopper Cliff Road – Non-Material Amendment of DC/18/0398/FUL Proposed single storey rear extension - Slight change to rear elevation window 3 rooflights Proposed window in existing dwelling - **PERMITTED**
DC/18/0651/FUL Harbour View Cliff Road - Proposed oak porch to front door with peg tile roof and brick plinths - **PERMITTED**
DC/18/0180/FUL Waldringfield Golf Club and Chapel Works Site Newbourne Road Demolition of existing buildings on the Chapel Works industrial area and the redevelopment of the site for 16 residential dwellings; the development of the golf course practice area for 33 age-restricted dwellings and 24 holiday chalets; together with landscaping, car parking, supporting infrastructure and the continued use of the existing points of vehicular access into the application site from Newbourne Road - **WITHDRAWN**
DC/18/0539/FUL Hut 18 Riverside - Demolition of two existing beach huts and construction of one replacement beach hut. No change of use - **PERMITTED.**
To **NOTE** any other planning-related information – There was none.

The Chairman closed the meeting at 8.11pm

WPC Planning Group comments on the following Planning Applications:

DC/18/1441/FUL Homewaters Cliff Road - Demolition of rear single storey extension with erection of larger extension and internal alterations - WPC has no objections to this application, principally as the current footprint of the dwelling is essentially maintained.

DC/18/0439/OUT Gorselands Newbourne Road - 18 houses, access road, lake and perimeter woodland.

WPC objects to this application and recommends that it is refused permission

The site currently contains a single bungalow and garden. We understand that the site is currently occupied in contravention of condition 2 of the planning consent to application E/3086/4 which limited occupation to a person employed locally in agriculture. The applicant applied for a lawful development certificate in July 2017 DC/17/1894/CLE. This application was refused by SCDC.

The property has been known as Gorse Farm, it now appears to go by the name of Gorselands.

Contrary to the assertions made by the applicant the proposed development site is in "the countryside" and is outside the physical limits of the village of Waldringfield by some distance (more than 1.5km by road).

The application shows no connectivity with the limited number of housing already at Waldringfield Heath, and will double the number of dwellings in this area of countryside. There is virtually no Public Transport in the area so all journeys to facilities such as healthcare, shops, employment, community centre etc will be taken by car. The application therefore does not comply with paras 32 & 35 of the NPPF.

The application implies that there will be a provision of a green energy supply but only describes the various forms currently on the market and doesn't specify which, if any, is to be included. Similarly the application contains a description of the passivhaus concept but does not indicate if/how these rigorous standards would be met within this proposed development.

The applicant doesn't state if mains water will be supplied to the proposed development. Residents at Waldringfield Heath currently rely on boreholes –these would be at risk of pollution from the proposed development. In addition, without a mains supply and appropriately placed hydrants there is no suitable water supply for the Fire Service in an emergency.

We understand that the site has previously been used for the burying of commercial waste and would therefore suspect that areas of the site might well be contaminated.

The applicant has not been able to show a need for such a development within the area covered by SP20. Since the applicant prepared this application the Outline application at Adastral Park has been permitted, S106 agreements are in place and the development is being actively progressed. This new application appears to be simply seeking to piggyback onto the Adastral Park housing allocation and subsequent permitted application. Suffolk Coastal's Local Plan Review Issues and Options document page 41 shows that since 2014, 2823 new homes have been committed to in the East of Ipswich area. This is considerably higher than the 2320 identified in SP20, (which includes Waldringfield, Newbourne etc), for the entire period of the Core Strategy (2013 – 2027).

The Eastern boundary of the Adastral Park site has been designed specifically to maintain a clear and significant separation between the Adastral Park development and the neighbouring countryside and indeed the AONB, in an effort to minimise its negative impact. Any additional, bolt-on development, such as this application would negate this agreed design. The site at Gorselands is currently a secluded haven for wildlife. Neighbouring properties have significant evidence of bat activity in the area and the trees within the Gorselands site currently provide excellent roosts for bats and birds, including owls. The application seeks to remove 20+ of these mature trees.

We are very concerned that this proposal will have a negative impact on the Deben SPA and do not agree with the conclusions of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal. The site is barely 1 kilometre from the Deben SPA (Ramsar) site. According to SCDC's Local Plan Appropriate Assessment this distance places it within a "regular" walking distance of the SPA, including walking with dogs, with the resultant increase in disturbance to birds and other wildlife. We would argue that the very limited on-site facilities would not provide an appropriate level of mitigation. We therefore consider that the effects of this proposal in-combination with the recently approved Adastral Park are likely to increase recreational pressures on the designated sites.

In summary, it is clear that the application does not comply with the following SCDC policies and therefore should not be permitted.

- It does not satisfy the requirements of SP19, SP29, DM3, and DM4 in relation to development within the countryside, in particular that within the countryside there should be "No development other than in exceptional circumstances" There are no exceptional circumstances in this case.
- It does not satisfy the requirements of SP27 as it is outside and quite separate from the physical limits of the local service centre (Waldringfield)
- It will have a negative in-combination effect on the Deben SPA.

The applicant appears to rely on his assertion that SCDC is not able to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply and that therefore all of the above policies should be considered out of date as described in NPPF para 49. However, more up-to-date information is now available, including the continuing upward trajectory of the number of house completions in 2016/17, the approval of the Adastral Park Outline application and the data (SHMA/OAN) now published in the Local Plan Review.

The applicant refers to the fact that the OAN at the time of the Core Strategy was 11,000 but the Council planned for a lower figure of 7900. The OAN figure identified through the SHMA report of 2017 has the benefit of more recent census and population data. In other words the OAN is based more firmly on actual numbers rather than the speculation and assumptions used for the OAN produced for the 2013 Core Strategy.

The most recent OAN shows an ongoing need for 465 dwellings pa, almost identical to that lower figure planned for in the Core Strategy. We would argue that this confirms that the OAN figure of 11,000 put forward at the time of the Core Strategy was significantly overestimated and as such is shown to be no longer valid. We understand that SCDC now believes that it can demonstrate a 5+ year housing land supply and trust that it will therefore give full weight to its existing policies when determining this inappropriate application.