

**BABERGH DISTRICT COUNCIL  
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

18<sup>th</sup> April 2018

**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/17/38**

<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>
2	DC/17/05196 & DC/17/05197	<p><b>Roger Kaye (Objector) Dated 6<sup>th</sup> April 2018</b></p> <p><b>Matt Dyson (Objector)</b></p> <p><b>SCC Highways (Reply to an Objector)</b></p>	<p><i>Massively of scale development, use of cheap materials, unsympathetic design in Conservation Area, inadequate parking spaces, highway safety issues caused by on-street parking, loss of neighbour amenity, massively extended operating hours</i></p> <p><i>Development would be detrimental to the character of the area. Development is not fitting for Stratford St Mary, parking issues. <b>Many other points were raised about the content of some additional information sent in by the applicant. However these issues are not considered to be material planning considerations.</b></i></p> <p><i>SCC has no concern over visibility splays for the site, there are no records of accidents at the location in the last five years, no records of speeding in this location, no highway concerns on existing output for vehicle volume, the existing function of the site is not detrimental to highway safety, the proposed intensification of use would not have a significant impact on highway safety.</i></p>	Samantha Summers

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>REF. NO</u>	<u>REPRESENTATION FROM</u>	<u>SUMMARY/COMMENTS</u>	<u>CASE OFFICER</u>
		<p><b>Dedham Vale Society</b></p> <p><b>Cllr Gordon Jones</b></p>	<p><i>Strong Objection: opposed to contemporary nature; inappropriate style, size and materials, seriously damaging to the conservation area and the Dedham Vale AONB.</i></p> <p><i>This planning application has only recently been brought to my attention, and unfortunately I am unable to attend the planning meeting due to prior engagements in my role as Cabinet Member for Children's Services, Education &amp; Skills</i></p> <p><i>I do however fully support the comments set out below.</i></p> <p><i>The car parking provision is totally inadequate; SCC's parking standards require 95 on-site parking spaces. Additional on-street parking is not an option due to considerable pressure in this area especially in the period from Spring to Autumn.</i></p> <p><i>Concern regarding flooding in the area opposite the Swan Inn, and further development will only worsen the risk. Flooding further up the street following from the development at The Maltings is reported, this has still not been resolved.</i></p> <p><i>Cllrs Carpendale &amp; Swan have been asked to raise my specific concerns on the highways/parking and flooding issues regarding this application, in the expectation that should the application be approved that the onsite parking provision is addressed and enlarged, and appropriate work is stipulated to reduce the flooding risk.</i></p>	

<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>
		<b>Roger Kaye (Objector) Dated 17th April 2018</b>	<p><i>Concern that SCC Highways have failed to assess the traffic risks and the LPA does not have full information to judge issues caused by overspill parking on Lower Street.</i></p> <p><i>The visibility splays from the revised exits from the proposed car park have not been addressed.</i></p> <p><i>Highways have failed to explain why no visibility splays have been set for the revised accesses for the car park. 150 metres along Lower Street (Old Maltings residential development) has built out into the carriageway for visibility reasons. Why is the Swan development exempt from proper consideration for vehicles exiting the revised car park via two new formal accesses?</i></p> <p><i>(Photographs of the Old Maltings have been submitted that will be available at the meeting if required).</i></p>	
3	DC/18/00236	<b>Place Services - Heritage</b>	<p><i>To the North West of the application site there is Nos 6 and 7 Richardsons Lane, a Gd II listed building. Further to the South is Mill House, again listed Gd II. There is a scattering of other traditional buildings within the vicinity, mostly dating from the 19th Century but heavily altered. The mill building to the North of Mill House might be considered a non-designated heritage asset.</i></p> <p><i>Concerns about the impact of the development upon the AONB and landscape generally are comprehensively addressed by the Landscape Consultant for Place Services. Provided these landscape concerns are taken on board, then the impact upon the setting of the listed buildings (the heritage assets) should be minimal.</i></p>	