

Mr Martin Brown

Babergh & Mid Suffolk Planning Officer
Endeavour House
Ipswich
Suffolk

Cllr. Barry C Gasper
Brook Ward Member
Burstall House
Burstall
Suffolk

4 December 2017

Dear Mr Brown

Subject: DC/17/03982 | Outline Planning Application (Access to be considered) -
Erection of up to 11 Dwellings including 3 Affordable Houses. | Land To The
East Of Duke Street, Hintlesham, North Of Red House Cottages

I fully support Hintlesham Parish Council objections to the above proposed development. My objections are primarily concerned with the detrimental cumulative effect on the Village's infrastructure, the lack of a need case for large dwellings and the problems associated with providing adequate schooling facilities, either in Hintlesham or Hadleigh. Additionally, the site remains outside of the village envelope and it was rejected on the Babergh 'call for sites'.

Housing need

CS11 states that all development outside of the Built Up Area Boundary (BUAB) of Hintlerland Villages, should, demonstrably meet a proven need for targeted market housing. It must be noted that recent Judicial Reviews define 'Local' as 'Parish' and not the whole of Babergh. This application makes no reference to Hintlesham's housing needs. Furthermore, I understand that no Housing or Community Needs Assessment has been provided. The demand for social housing in Hintlesham, has been more than met, with the recent development of 10 properties in Timperleys, with only half being occupied by local residents. In the last 10 years over 40 dwellings have received planning permission in Hintlesham, with just over half still to be completed. Therefore, I support the Parish Councils view that the needs case for further development in Hintlesham has diminished, with every approved application recently granted.

Cumulative effect

The cumulative impact of the recent developments has highlighted two aspects of village infrastructure, which are at full capacity.

- Firstly, the excessive traffic volumes on the A1071 and their impact on the village are well documented. Planned development in cluster areas of Hadleigh and the Ipswich fringe, further impact on the A1071 and Duke Street.
- Secondly, the vibrant village primary school is full and is currently turning away village children, who have to travel to Hadleigh. Clearly the village and area educational provision cannot accommodate the existing population. The 25 dwellings which are yet to be completed/occupied will further frustrate an already unacceptable situation.

CS11 states that services and facilities must have capacity to accommodate further development. However, it is demonstrable that Hintlesham cannot accommodate another 11 dwellings.

I understand that Hintlesham Parish Council fully supports the Sequential Approach outlined in CS11 Paragraph 11, which states that future development should be restricted to sites within the built up area. Clearly, Hintlesham's housing needs will be adequately met by dwellings currently with planning permission, but still yet to be built. Furthermore, that there are adequate potential infill sites currently within the village envelope.

Site and Built Up Area Boundary

Only one of the 11 proposed dwellings adjoins the village BUAB. Indeed the whole site is totally outside the existing and the new proposed BUAB, set out in the Draft Local Plan. Also CS 11 states that development should be 'well designed and appropriate in size/scale to its setting and to the village'. The large size of some of the proposed dwellings is not in keeping with the existing village architecture. In particular, the scale of one of the proposed houses compromises the integrity of the adjoining modest Red House Farm Cottages.

This proposed development, if approved, would result in a continuous line of settlement on Duke Street. Planners recognise the need for a diverse village panorama, with areas of undeveloped land representing important visual receptors. This panorama enhances the environmental features of the village and should not be lost. Furthermore, this issue is even more important here, as the proposed development is wholly within the Gipping Valley Special Landscape Area.

Design detail

The topography of the proposed site emphasizes the dwellings size, which accentuates the impact of the development, making it significantly more imposing than it looks on the submitted Street Elevation. The proposed houses would loom above local buildings, since the ground is much higher on the development site, namely, the east side of Duke Street. An additional hazard identified, is associated with parked vehicles, which will inevitably be parked outside the proposed properties, reducing visibility on the rising ground.

In conclusion

This application fails to meet three important and robust planning principles, namely: that services must have the capacity to accommodate further development, cumulative impact of development is a material planning consideration and that a need must be demonstrable. The proposed development fails to meet all these principles and I request that it be rejected.

Yours sincerely

Barry C Gasper

Member for Brook Ward