

LEVINGTON AND STRATTON HALL PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF PLANNING PARISH COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON

5th FEBRUARY 2019 IN THE VILLAGE HALL AT 7.00 PM

Present: Councillors: David Long, Chairman ('DL'); David Pryke, Vice-Chairman ('DP'); John Bailey ('JB'); Andrew Abram ('AA')
Parish Clerk: Lucy Buckle ('LB'); No members of the public

VILLAGE FORUM

An opportunity for residents to give comments on any issues *on the agenda*. (Per standing orders: Max 15 minutes unless otherwise directed by the Chairman; a member of the public shall not speak for more than 3 minutes). No comments made.

The formal business of the meeting commenced at 7.15pm

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies: Ian Angus ('IA'), Pat Pryke ('PP'); James Ramsay ('JR');

CODE OF CONDUCT & DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Refer to Suffolk Code of Conduct from time to time and update Register of Interests as required. State any Declarations of Interest in this Agenda. None were declared at the meeting.

Planning:

1. To consider the soundness and response of the SCDC Final Draft Local Plan, including:
 - Innocence Farm - SCLP12.35

DP and JB have been attending the Cross-Boundary Parish Council Innocence Farm Group and have been tasked with presenting the case that Innocence Farm was not the right place development.

The attached is their first draft which they ran through at the meeting:

The case for using Innocence Farm for port related facilities is not made.

13. Lichfields presented, in their report, an evaluation of 10 possible sites for port-related activities. Their methodology was a simplistic one in which six factors were identified as relevant and each was given a score in a range 0-5.

The system used resulted in Innocence Farm emerging as the most favored location, not because of the facts of the case but rather because of the design of the scoring system. Some examples of the inherent problems in the Lichfield methodology are presented in a-h below.

- a. Six factors were identified for each site each then given a score in the range 0-5 making the maximum possible score for a site 30. The limitations of this simple approach are many but two stand out. Firstly, the assumption that the appropriate factors have been identified and secondly that each merits an equal weighting. The report presents no cogent arguments to support this methodology or recognise its limitations in this case. It is understandable that the consultant wishes to provide something quantitative but the resultant numbers from this method cannot be described as objective and helpful.
- b. As an example of a missing factor there is the issue of proximity to the Port. This is presented elsewhere in the Report as a factor of major importance, yet it is not a factor used in the analysis. There may be an assumption by the analyst(s) that since all the sites 'scored' are between the Port and the Orwell Crossing differences in distance are irrelevant. Distance is a

factor to be considered since it determines such issues as the source and location of moving vehicle pollution.

- c. The site selection criteria do not include any term related to the wide range of pollution that the use of the identified sites would cause. Atmospheric, particulate, noise and light pollution will occur at all the selected sites but not in equal measure. The absence of a this issue of pollution in the site selection criteria is a serious omission particularly since it will be 24 hour pollution each and every day. Kirton and Falkenham Parish Council made a detailed submission on this issue during the Issues and Options consultation and that this factor is not included is cause for concern
- d. Page 727 of "Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report of the Suffolk Coastal First Draft Local Plan Appendices June 2018 gives a green scoring of positive to "Improve the health.." This calls into question the robustness and credibility of the Plan when it claims that despite converting 114ha from agricultural land use to industrial use with noise, light and chemical pollution from 24 hour operations can be considered a 'green positive.
- e. The issue of whether a site is situated west or east of the A14 seems not to have entered the scoring considerations.
- f. The great differences in infrastructure demands seem not to have any impact on the scoring except in relation to Christmas Wood.
- g. The scoring for site ownership and availability seems to command only 0 or 5. This can skew the scoring.
- h. The costs associated with developing the sites and of putting a suitable infrastructure in place are not considered in the analysis. There is no evidence of consideration being given to the assessment of associated costs at the sites analysed.

The Parish Council was also aware of other groups and individuals considering this site and making their own comments, especially the Kirton and Trimley Community Action Group (KATCAG).

JB raised the point that there were many Groups responding to the Local Plan and what would be the best approach was to not bombard the Inspector with multi arguments. The concern was also that people could be spending a lot of time on what may be non-starter items as the Inspector would already be aware of many of the facts and comments through the previous two rounds of public consultation.

The Inspector it was noted would be rigorous and non-biased in his approach and any response from the Parish Council should be concise and our opinions clear.

It was also discussed that this proposed development was all for the benefit of one employer the Port and what was the long-term demand outlook for the Port?

The biggest concern the Council agreed, was that of the additional traffic that Innocence Farm would create and the knock-on environmental impacts (light, noise and pollution), not just to the local area but also further afield especially as parts of the Parish had an ANOB status.

The traffic survey that had been done was very superficial and lacked any detail plan of how traffic flows would be managed or re-routed if the Orwell Bridge for example was to be shut.

The Parish Council had raised the point of settlement coalescence between Ipswich and Felixstowe on the east/west axis in previous consultations on the Local Plan but would add the detrimental impact on the open and natural environment on the north/south axis which result in a coalescence between the estuaries of the Rivers Orwell and Deben. It was agreed to respond to SCDC concentrating on the very important lack of traffic strategy.

- Land near 7 Hills Junction - SCLP 12.20

The Council had no strong objections apart from the lack of traffic management strategy and if any new road infrastructure would be developed? All agreed that the respond back to SCDC would be based on the lack of traffic strategy not being made available therefore insufficient information to make a sound decision.

- Bridge Road, Levington -SCLP 12.57 - 20 dwellings.

No objections apart from noted that 20 houses on such a small plot would be rather cramped and to keep in character with the immediate and wider built environment the number of dwellings considered for this site should be fewer.

- Planning Inspector examination – no comments

2. Walk Farm - to note decision of SCDC and complaint update:

Clerk updated the Parish Council that she had raised a complaint to the Planning Inspector with regard to incorrect information being stated on the Parish Council's response to Walk Farm DC18/3197/FUL. SCDC have been in contact saying that they would be in contact after the 15th February 19.

3. Sizewell C Consultation - response to the options

The decision was to take this to the next Parish Council meeting on the 6th March 2019.

4. Non-material Amendment of DC/16/4757/FUL - Erection of a single storey 33kV electrical switch house with a new access created onto Stratton Hall Drift - Farmland Adjacent to Stratton Hall Drift Stratton Hall Suffolk – no objections made to this application.

Meeting Closed at 8.45pm