

HASKETON PARISH COUNCIL
PARISH CLERK – DAVID KEEBLE
1 TOP STREET, MARTLESHAM, WOODBRIDGE, SUFFOLK IP12 4RB
TEL: 07475568637 Email clerk.hasketon@gmail.com

Record of Decision of Hasketon Parish Council in respect of Planning Application DC/20/1172/FUL

The Parish Council have made the following recommendation in respect of Planning Application DC/20/1172/FUL erection of 4 new dwellings and 2no garages plus associated vehicular accesses and driveways, Land South of Low Road, Hasketon, which was submitted to East Suffolk Council planning department on 6th April 2020. The details are as follows: -

Date: 6th April 2020

FAO Case Officer Danielle Miller

Dear Sir/Madam,

Proposal: Construction of 4 no new dwellings, 2no garages and associated vehicular accesses and driveway.

Address: Land south of Low Road, Hasketon, IP13 6JG

Town/Parish: Hasketon
DC/20/1172/FUL

File Ref:

Agent:

Peter Wells
Peter Wells Architects Ltd
Office Farm
Letheringham
Woodbridge
IP13 7RA

Applicant:

Mr M Copping
Maison Investments Ltd
34 Ludbrook Close
Needham Market
IP6 8EE

Recommendation:

The Parish Council has considered the available documents in respect of this planning application and recommend the application be refused for the reasons detailed below:-

Traffic.

1. Hasketon village is a small rural settlement, accessed by narrow roads, mostly one vehicle width. It has no school and the current County Council school transport policy requires children to walk, cycle or be driven to the nearest schools in Woodbridge and Grundisburgh. 4 new houses could present a relatively significant increase in numbers and would constitute an increased risk. There is ongoing concern amongst residents because of traffic volume and speed through the village which the Parish Council is currently trying to address with Suffolk County Council Highways which this development is likely to exacerbate.

2. There is a very limited public transport service for the village which necessitates most residents having at least one or two cars to access local services i.e. Woodbridge/Martlesham. This would appear to be contrary to the Council's environmental commitment to reduce car usage,

3. Low road is a narrow single track road. It is the access road to the Turks Head Restaurant and Public House which has recently been granted planning consent for eight holiday lodges. In addition planning consents have been granted near Rose Cottage (two properties) and Owls Cottage (single property). Also the most recent large development in the village has been the 4 properties built on land adjacent the Turks Head. Any further developments would have a significant impact on traffic volume which is likely to be detrimental to the wellbeing of existing residents of Low Road.

4. Construction traffic would create considerable problems, as there is no turning opportunity in Low Road and the nature of Low Road beyond the development site is not suitable for vehicles larger than cars. All construction traffic would be required to turn on site which is likely to present problems given the nature of the site and the drainage issues mentioned under..

5. The existing line of semi-detached properties opposite the Turks Head have the benefit of a private service road. Elsewhere Low Road is bounded by high banks, privately owned, which provide for no passing places. Beyond the proposed development Low road bends at 90* and narrows even further and is bounded by high hedges, a feature of this rural landscape, plus it is prone to flooding.

6. The row of properties to the east of the site are accessed by a small service road. Opposite, the highly popular Turks Head Public House and Restaurant opens onto Low Road. Access to the development shows three vehicular accesses all close to a blind bend with visibility obscured by the hedge lines bordering the roadside. The visibility issues would constitute an unnecessary risk to all road users.

7. Access by service vehicles i.e. bin lorries, emergency vehicles etc, is likely to be problematic for the reasons stated previously.

8. There are limited employment opportunities locally and it is likely residents in any new development would have to travel for employment purposes increasing vehicle use.

Visual Amenity

9. The design of the proposed development is not in keeping with the visual amenity of the existing line of semi-detached properties and the development is outside the Physical Limits Boundary (Defined Limits) for the village which could set a precedent for any future development. The development appears to be contrary to the Council's Development Management Policy regarding housing clusters in Suffolk Coastal villages.

10. The site lies outside the village defined area, in a rural landscape and a development of this scale would cause undue harm to the character and appearance of the existing properties and have a harmful visual intrusion into the surrounding landscape. It appears to be contrary to the Council's Housing Clusters Policy in relation to filling and ribbon development (DMP (DM4) pages 92/93)

Water Management/Flood Risk

11. Whilst the land is not identified as a flood plain known local knowledge provides that it is an important drainage area for both the natural springs rising on land opposite and surface water run off. The development site is known locally to be a wet meadow and provides drainage for both surface water run off from Low road (both directions) and from the valley to the north from Whitehouse Farm past Gull Farm. Any interference with the drainage properties on this site is likely to impact on the area especially adjacent properties which already experience frequent flooding in winter and at times of high rainfall.

12. The proposed development appears to show no provision for disposal of sewage and surface water. The village has no mains gas nor mains drainage.

Natural Landscape

13. Removal of the hedge to the front of the site would be contrary to the Councils current planning policy on protection of rural landscape character. It would also likely impact on the drainage aspect previously mentioned. A replacement hedge would be severely limited due to the 3 vehicular accesses and the narrowness of the highway at that point and is unlikely to compensate for the loss of the existing established hedgerow which is an integral part of the local rural landscape within this designated Special Landscape Area.

14. The development site is known to provide an important wildlife corridor with frequent sightings of deer, foxes and a variety of wetland birds i.e. heron, egret et al. as well as Barn Owls and other diminishing species. This development would have a serious impact on this important wildlife corridor.

15. The overall development appears to be an over development of the site given its location outside the village defined area and the proximity of adjacent properties.

The Parish Council also request that this application be considered by the full Planning Committee in view of the above factors.

Parish Councillors consulted in this decision making process were A. McWhirter, S. Butters. J. Withey, A. Turner and R Batley. Parish Councillors I. Whyte and S. Dack declared an interest and were exempted from inclusion in the consultation process.

Also considered were comments and observations from residents and other information available on ESC planning portal.

The Parish Council have acted in accordance with the resolution passed at the Extraordinary PC meeting held on 21st March 2020 following advice and guidance issued to Councils in light of the current Coronavirus Emergency.

No physical PC meeting has been held and therefore there are no minutes available and this statement is the sole record of said decision.

Signed;.....Parish Clerk

Date:.....

Signed;.....Chairman

Date.....