

Stonham Aspal Parish Council repeats its objection to this scheme outside the village boundary.

1. The application doesn't meet the requirements as set out in Article 6 of the Town and Country Planning Order 2015.

Contrary to what you may have been told, Outline Planning consent does not create a "blank sheet of paper". The order states that "The details of the reserved matters application MUST be in line with the outline approval" in respect of Appearance, Layout and Scale.

Significant changes require a new application.

At the previous Planning Committee meeting, it was suggested that four and five bedroomed houses did not need to be of significantly greater scale than the two and three bed properties indicated and approved at Outline stage.

We have measured the footprint of the houses and garages on the current plans. They are at least 42% bigger (nearly half as big again) than the Outline indicated development – as well as being significantly more massive. Remember that two of the houses at Outline were bungalows.

If the Committee agrees that these changes are "significant" the current application must automatically be refused because it is not in line with the Outline Approved scheme.

2. MSDC now has almost double the required housing land supply, so we believe that the focus should be on building the "right" houses for local needs. The supposed "Public Benefits" of this revised scheme are spurious. The original Outline application specifically mentioned the need for smaller houses in the area. The people who can afford the 4/5 bedroom scale houses now proposed will not be working in this Hinterland village.
3. The revised scale of the buildings will create a major increase in traffic movements over and above that envisaged at outline approval. Young people live at home these days, and will have their own cars and motorbikes.

The bigger scale proposed will result in significantly greater harm to the enjoyment of existing and future residents of Quoits Meadow by increased noise and disturbance from vehicles and pedestrians and by disturbance from vehicle headlamps at night time.

4. Impact on the significance and setting of the Grade II Heritage Asset. We are pleased to see that the Heritage Team and Case Officer have reread their previous objections and recognise that placing enormous five bedroomed houses and garage blocks between a listed farmhouse and its context in the rural landscape does have an impact on the significance and setting of the Heritage Asset greater than the 3 bedroom bungalows indicated and approved at Outline stage.
5. The attenuation pond is clearly outside the red line, and requires separate consent. We accept that you are able to approve the design of the surface water drainage system within the site, but we do not believe that you can properly discharge this condition until it is demonstrated that the water has somewhere to go to.
6. Our concerns about the positioning of the bin store alongside existing properties and the distance new residents will be expected to drag them have been ignored. Suffolk Waste

Partnership recommends a maximum of 30m. This is far further.

7. We do not find the lack of safe provision for pedestrians acceptable – and the plans are silent on who will be maintaining the verges where they are expected to seek refuge.

You might find the design of the houses attractive in themselves, but it is the impact of their scale, design and layout on the landscape and on adjoining properties that you are being asked to consider.

The Parish Council does not agree that the major increase in scale of these buildings after Outline Approval is acceptable; and we believe the impact of the increase in scale on residential amenity and Heritage Assets significantly outweigh the doubtful Public Benefits of the proposal. We therefore urge the Planning Committee to respect and support the needs of this village community and refuse the application – not just on Heritage grounds, but also the other reasons identified above, and especially the significant increase in scale from the Outline consent.

Note: The “representations” in support in the case report are all from one individual – not multiple people as the 5 bullet points used by the Case Officer might suggest.