

**BABERGH DISTRICT COUNCIL  
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

8 November 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/17/21**

<u><b>ITEM</b></u>	<u><b>REF. NO</b></u>	<u><b>REPRESENTATION FROM</b></u>	<u><b>SUMMARY/COMMENTS</b></u>	<u><b>CASE OFFICER</b></u>
8A	B/17/00091	Agent	Topographical survey received 31.10.17	Kathryn Oelman
8A	B/17/00091	SCC Flood & Water Team	Confirm they have no objections 02.11.17	Kathryn Oelman
8A	B/17/00091	Correction Report: Part 4 Conclusion (pages 20 & 21)	Part 4, paragraph 14 should read “...presumption against harm to the <b>setting of a listed building or/and the setting of the conservation area</b> ” and Paragraphs 11 and 15 of Part 4 should read “...by <b>Sections 66 (1) and/or 73(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.</b> ”	Kathryn Oelman
8B	DC/17/03100	Response from SCC Strategic Development- Resource Management.	There is some surplus capacity. When applications exceed the number of places available the admissions policy will kick-in – siblings get priority but otherwise out of catchment children will have lower priority than catchment children.	Melanie Corbishley

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>REF. NO</u>	<u>REPRESENTATION FROM</u>	<u>SUMMARY/COMMENTS</u>	<u>CASE OFFICER</u>
		<p>As part of the Joint Local Plan consultation, Lavenham Parish Council made the following additional comments:</p>	<p><b>Education</b>  The draft education policy falls within Infrastructure in the JLP. Existing schools have little room to manoeuvre to take additional pupils. The County budget for new build either to extend an existing school or to provide a new school is inadequate. The JLP view therefore is that new school build will be driven by the Community Investment Levy. A standard new primary school (210 pupils) would require approximately 900 new dwellings.  Each village needs to look closely at where its children go to school and that school's year on year capacity. Historically, primary school children have been accommodated within their own village school or their immediate environs. There is no primary school provision planned in the JLP.  To understand the number of pupils arising from proposed sites the pupil yields for 100 homes is; 25 primary school age, 18 secondary school age and 4 pupils for sixth form age.  The County Education Department forecasts for the development sites yet to commence within Lavenham are as follows;  1, 18 units on the former SCC highways site – detailed planning permission granted and included in SCC educational estimates.  2. 25 units west of Deacon's Close – outline planning permission granted and <b>NOT</b> included in SCC educational estimates.</p>	

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>REF. NO</u>	<u>REPRESENTATION FROM</u>	<u>SUMMARY/COMMENTS</u>	<u>CASE OFFICER</u>										
			<p>3. 25 units Melford Road, west of Howletts Garage, going to the Planning Committee 6<sup>th</sup> November 2017 and <b>NOT</b> included in SCC educational estimates.</p> <p>4. 25 units Bears Lane, yet to go to the Planning Committee and <b>NOT</b> included in SCC educational estimates.</p> <p>Lavenham Primary School has a current capacity of 105 children. With year class capacity (PAN) of 20, this school capacity could grow to 140. Forecasted capacity by year is;</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2017</th> <th>2018</th> <th>2019</th> <th>2020</th> <th>2021</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>108</td> <td>114</td> <td>116</td> <td>115</td> <td>114</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>It follows that as the developments 2., 3., and 4., above come on stream any sequential test will need to come into play and where necessary through lack of capacity thwart any commencement by at least deferral.</p>	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	108	114	116	115	114	
2017	2018	2019	2020	2021										
108	114	116	115	114										
8B	DC/17/03100	Correction to report At Paragraph 4.21 on page 37	The recommendation from SCC Archaeology should be altered as they did not recommend any conditions.	Melanie Corbishley										
8B	DC/17/03100	Correction to report On page 29 the drawing labels have been updated.	The documents are listed below: Defined Red Line Plan 633 001 A - Received 20/06/2017 Site Plan EXISTING 633 002 A - Received 20/06/2017 Site Plan 633 003-1-2 - Received 22/09/2017 Highway Access Plan H01175/15/002 D - Received 22/09/2017	Melanie Corbishley										

<b><u>ITEM</u></b>	<b><u>REF. NO</u></b>	<b><u>REPRESENTATION FROM</u></b>	<b><u>SUMMARY/COMMENTS</u></b>	<b><u>CASE OFFICER</u></b>
8B	DC/17/03100	Correction to report At paragraph 11.2 there is an error in the items to be included within the s106.	Paragraph 11.2 should read: The application, if approved, would require the completion of a S106 agreement to secure the required number of affordable dwellings and open space as set out previously in the report.	
8C	B/16/01360	Correction to Report	At Paragraph 2.5 on Page 57 the number of two bedroom flats should be 4 and not 3 as stated.	John Davies
8D	B/17/01023	Further comments of Sudbury Town Council on latest plans:	“No social housing included. Height issue – base of site already above street level. Parking issues - We note that Suffolk County Council highways deem parking allocated to be sufficient. However we recommend REFUSAL on the grounds of the height of the building is a cause for concern and compromises the street scene. Thought needs to be given to design – should be in keeping with any proposals for Belle Vue site. Current design inappropriate for location and compromises street scene. BDC member to recommend discussions with local residents.”	John Davies