

From: [Elizabeth Flood](#)
To: [Robert Carmichael](#)
Subject: FW: Land south of Whatfield Road, Elmsett, DC/19/03445
Date: 11 February 2020 16:25:05
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Elizabeth Flood

Principal Planning Officer
Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils

Tel: 0784 9078665
Email: elizabeth.flood@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

I work Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday.

From: BMSDC Planning Area Team Blue <planningblue@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>
Sent: 11 February 2020 15:28
To: Elizabeth Flood <Elizabeth.Flood@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Land south of Whatfield Road, Elmsett, DC/19/03445

Dear Libby,

Please see the response from Elmsett Parish Council concerning the letter from Greenwood Solicitors.

Regards

Vanessa Pannell

(Part Time) Technical Support Officer- Development Management

Sustainable Communities

Working for Babergh District Council and Mid Suffolk District Council

Tel: 01449 724547
Tel: 0300 1234000 For all Council services

Email: planningblue@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk
Websites: www.babergh.gov.uk www.midsuffolk.gov.uk

Please be advised that any comments expressed in this email are offered at an officer level as a professional opinion and are given without prejudice to any decision or action the Council may take in the future. Please check with the emails author if you are in any doubt about the status of the advice given within this email



From: Andrea Newman <elmsettpc@btinternet.com>

Sent: 11 February 2020 12:40

To: BMSDC Planning Area Team Blue <planningblue@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>

Subject: Land south of Whatfield Road, Elmsett, DC/19/03445

Land south of Whatfield Road, Elmsett, DC/19/03445

The parish council notes that the letter dated 7th February from Fisher Jones Greenwood in support of the application only became live on your website yesterday (10th February) our comments on each paragraph of the letter are as follows:

1 – Social conscience is not a land-use planning matter and the fact that money is available to commence the development now should be set aside by the Planning Committee in its determination of the application.

2 – Views are referred to in Policy EMST9 of the Neighbourhood Plan and the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the one identified.

3 – Regardless of what the application would deliver, there is no identified local need for the amount of housing proposed and it therefore remains contrary to the development plan.

4 – The application before the Committee should be refused and if the applicant wishes to submit a new application with a different mix then that should be considered separately (albeit that it would remain contrary to the development plan). The amended plan referred to is not publicly available.

5 – The development is not required to support local services but will impact on the road network

6 – They're outside the Built Up Area Boundary (BUAB)

7 – That was then when it was wrongly assigned, this is now Elmsett is confirmed as a Hinterland Village

8 – The NPPF is also clear that the up-to-date development plan is the starting point for decision making.

9 – The report also highlights that the proposal is contrary to the neighbourhood plan which is the up-to-date development plan

10 – The proposal for 48.6% one or two bedroomed dwellings is not what has been applied for and has not been consulted on.

11 – It has not been demonstrated how the development would support the bus

service

12 – But the application does not identify that a local need exists.

13 – Additional housing is not required as the emerging Local Plan requirement has already been substantially exceeded.

14 - The report also highlights that the proposal is contrary to the neighbourhood plan which is the up-to-date development plan

15 – But the applicant has not demonstrated that there is a local need that cannot be met by existing approvals.

16 - While the Neighbourhood Plan was examined in the context of the 2012 NPPF, the housing numbers proposed are in excess of those identified in Policy SP04 and Table 04 of the Preferred Options Joint Local Plan. The housing numbers cannot therefore be dismissed as there is no evidence that the requirement in Elmsett should be any different. The Joint Local Plan housing numbers and the locational strategy for them have been challenged through the Preferred Options consultation and they should therefore not be relied on for decision making. The Neighbourhood Plan therefore carries greater weight in the decision-making process than the Preferred Options Joint Local Plan document.

17 – There is no need for the Neighbourhood Plan to identify new sites. It has already embraced far in excess of the housing required in the emerging joint local plan.

Could you please forward to Elizabeth Flood and Vanessa Parnell.