

**BABERGH DISTRICT COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

27 September 2017

**SUMMARY OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED SINCE THE PUBLICATION OF THE AGENDA BUT BEFORE
12 NOON ON THE WORKING DAY BEFORE THE MEETING AND ERRATA**

PAPER PL/17/16

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>REF. NO</u>	<u>REPRESENTATION FROM</u>	<u>SUMMARY/COMMENTS</u>	<u>CASE OFFICER</u>
1	<u>B/17/00122/FUL</u>	Interested Party (Neighbour) Strategic Housing	<p>1 additional letter received making the following summarised objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about the 5 year housing land supply and how this has been calculated. • Cumulative impacts need to be considered • Local views must be taken into account • Impact on Days Road – insufficient consideration given to this. • The disadvantages of the scheme do not outweigh the benefits. <p>The open market mix proposed as part of this application is in the form of: -</p> <p>8 x 2 bed houses (9 houses in the previous application) @ 61.3 sqm – these are very small houses and would have small bedrooms. These have not been amended since the previous application which is disappointing.</p> <p>1 x 2 bed FOG @ 79.4 sqm</p> <p>8 x 2 bed bungalows – these are a welcomed inclusion. There were 8 households in the LHNS indicating they required 2BB's in the open market.</p>	Gemma Pannell

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>REF. NO</u>	<u>REPRESENTATION FROM</u>	<u>SUMMARY/COMMENTS</u>	<u>CASE OFFICER</u>
			<p>1 x 4 bed bungalow – this should be replaced with a 3-bed bungalow or chalet bungalow to meet local demand. This has not been amended in the new application which is disappointing.</p> <p>22 x 3 bed semi-detached houses</p> <p>4 x 3 bed detached houses</p> <p>16 x 4 bed houses</p> <p>2 x 5 bed detached houses (there were 3 in the previous application) – there is already a good supply of larger houses available in Capel St Mary so it is felt that these are inappropriate for this village.</p> <p>To meet planning policy 35% of 97 units = 34 affordable units</p> <p>The applicant has proposed the affordable units as: -</p> <p>Affordable rent: -</p> <p>8 x 1 bed 2-person apartments @ minimum of 48.1 sqm 2 x 2 bed 4-person apartments @ 70.4 sqm 4 x 2 bed 4-person bungalows @ minimum of 79.1 sqm 6 x 2 bed 4-person houses @ 79.9 sqm 4 x 3 bed 5-person houses @ 88 sqm</p> <p>Shared ownership: -</p> <p>4 x 2 bed 4-person houses @ 79 sqm 1 x 2-bed 4-person house @ 82.8 sqm 3 x 3 bed 5-person houses @ 88 sqm</p> <p>This mix and provision is acceptable and the space standards meet our requirements.</p>	

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>REF. NO</u>	<u>REPRESENTATION FROM</u>	<u>SUMMARY/COMMENTS</u>	<u>CASE OFFICER</u>
2	B/17/00950/FUL	Stour and Orwell Society	<p>A 12 page letter has been received to register the very strong objections of the Society, the issues raised are summarised as follows;</p> <p><u>AONB:</u> Site was specifically excluded in the SHLAA in May 2016;</p> <p>An open area of agricultural land would be lost from the AONB that currently enhances the character and intrinsic value of the area and the form and setting of the village;</p> <p>34 dwellings (11% increase) in the AONB within a smaller “hinterland village” must be considered ‘major’ development; major development should only be allowed “<i>in exceptional circumstances where it can be demonstrated that such circumstances are in the public interest</i>”;</p> <p>There are alternative development sites available within the village but outside of the AONB;</p> <p>Contrary to Local Plan policies and paragraphs 115 and 116 of the NPPF;</p> <p>Loss of mature hedge along Church Road; wider impact on the AONB including the loss of tranquillity within the area and the increase in traffic movement along confined and narrow lanes;</p> <p><u>Landscape Impact:</u> the Society does not agree with the submitted LVIA report which concluded that ‘<i>the special landscape qualities... of the AONB would be unharmed</i>’;</p> <p>Proposal is contrary to the Landscape Strategy for Shotley Peninsula Plateau;</p>	Lynda Bacon

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>REF. NO</u>	<u>REPRESENTATION FROM</u>	<u>SUMMARY/COMMENTS</u>	<u>CASE OFFICER</u>
			<p>Do not agree with the conclusion that by year ten the effects of the proposal on landscape character could be considered “moderate beneficial after 10 years”.</p> <p><u>Highways:</u> Object to the use of a narrow lane with single tracked access when there are other sites within the village;</p> <p>Footpath from Holbrook Road through the site into Stutton Close is only a permissive right that could be closed;</p> <p>Church Road is often blocked by deliveries.</p> <p><u>Housing Need:</u> The applicant has made no assessment of housing needs in the village;</p> <p>Scheme is an outline application which could change;</p> <p><u>5 yr housing land supply:</u> Challenge the Council’s figures and consider the analysis of shortfall, delivery, trajectory and windfall sites to be insufficient. An urgent review is required and this application should not be determined prior to review.</p>	
3	DC/17/03272	Additional officer assessment (EBNP)	<p>The following policies of the East Bergholt Neighbourhood Plan have been considered as part of the officers assessment:</p> <p>Policy EB20 – Tourist Facilities and Services.</p> <p>Policy EB20 requires that developments that provide facilities or services for the visitor or tourist should be supported provided that they:</p>	Natalie Webb

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>REF. NO</u>	<u>REPRESENTATION FROM</u>	<u>SUMMARY/COMMENTS</u>	<u>CASE OFFICER</u>
			<p>1. Demonstrate that they would conserve and enhance the landscape, heritage, character and appearance of the area.</p> <p>Special consideration should be given to developments in or affecting the setting of the Dedham Vale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (Map 9) and the East Bergholt Conservation Area (Map 18)</p> <p>2. Would not have an unacceptable impact on the local highway network and would provide adequate parking provision;</p> <p>3. Be of a scale and design that is sensitive to the character of the landscape and heritage of the area; and</p> <p>4. Would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on nearby residential or other uses.</p> <p>The officers report considers at paragraph 9 how the proposal is considered to impact on the landscape and AONB Policy EB20 (1) & (3) and the impact on the highway network at paragraph 10 Policy EB20 (2) and paragraph 11 Residential amenity Policy EB20 (4).</p>	