

Action East Bergholt

Ms Gemma Pannell
Planning Department
Babergh District Council
Corks Lane
Hadleigh
IP7 6SJ

11th June 2017

Re: B/16/01092 - Land east of The Constable Country Medical Centre, Heath Rd, East Bergholt

Objection to Outline Planning Application

Dear Ms Pannell

I should like to put on record that we strongly object to the above outline planning application relating to proposed development of 75 homes. Our main reasons are as follows:

- Loss of valuable agricultural land.
- Damage to visual amenity, being visible from donkey track and adjoin property
- Given this number of dwellings, this development would pre-empt the local need identified in the NP and thus the development does not satisfy NP, CS or fundamental 'sustainability' principles of NPPF
- No justification made for incremental housing need due to employment growth
- Highway dangers already articulated in B/15/00673 equally apply here, added to the additional danger of site being adj. to high speed track for traffic approaching from Manningtree. With additional issues of adjacency to Medical Practice and High School
- Developments adds further complexity to travel issues, either increase in traffic flows, or more pressure on rail links from Manningtree, with its inadequate parking. Said issue also increases parking in East Bergholt village centre, due to inadequacy of connecting bus services, and cycle routes to Manningtree, Ipswich and Colchester are not viable for the average commuter.
- Even if early housing growth were needed in the area, (which it isn't in East Bergholt) there is already adequate supply in the 'housing supply' chain in Tendring district. There is no evidence of consultation with Tendring where 118 built or under construction + c400 + more awaiting determination within 3 miles of the Heath Rd proposed site. Where is the local need for this many dwellings?
- Approval of this application would frustrate the 'Community Housing' (CLT) efforts of East Bergholt, (currently in its formative stage), which plans to provide the village's

identified NP housing requirements over a longer more sustainable period, with affordable units managed for ongoing use of villagers. BDC are represented at the group/Trustee meetings and fully aware of site allocation progress.

- The development is clearly non-compliant with many areas of the Neighbourhood Plan and in particular the number of dwellings (75)..
- It is also non-compliant with the current Core Strategy as it fails to support the ‘organic’ growth of the village.
- It has the wrong housing mix as an excess of larger houses and a failure to meet the required housing mix as demonstrated in the Housing Survey.
- There appears to be a lack of a local need assessment and a failure to show any sort of alignment to the Community Objectives.
- The development is some 1.75km from the centre of the village and therefore the majority of the essential amenities. Your own CS11 clearly states the following:
 - Desirable – 400 metres
 - Acceptable – 800 metres
 - Preferred max - 1200 metre
- Pre requisite of all planning applications is they be financially viable There has been no financial justification and need for a swimming pool, and to support the very questionable concept, it is extremely rare that any pool within a rural area or in any town is currently financially justifiable, or ever likely to be. This then means that longer term financial support will inevitably be required, and as everywhere else, ultimately supported by District or Parish Councils.

In conclusion therefore we strongly recommend that this application should be rejected.

As a formal Consultee we wish to make our representation at the Planning Hearing which we understand is currently due to be heard on 5th July

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Peter Dent', with a large flourish above the name and a horizontal line below it.

Peter Dent. Chair – **Action** East Bergholt