

**BABERGH DISTRICT COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE
17 October 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/18/13

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>REF. NO</u>	<u>REPRESENTATION FROM</u>	<u>SUMMARY/COMMENTS</u>	<u>CASE OFFICER</u>
1	DC/18/02513	Applicant	<p><i>The applicant has submitted revised plans relating to parking and these will be discussed at the start of the meeting. The committee will be requested following advice from the Legal Officer to defer this item to enable further consideration of the amended plans.</i></p> <p>The Applicant has carried out an overnight Parking Stress survey of streets within 200m of the site. The survey was conducted on two nights and counted the amount of occupied kerbside parking available at those times which was expressed as a percentage of total available road space.</p> <p>As a guide to the significance of the figures the Report indicated that 85% parking occupancy is an indicative level at which parking stress becomes a cause for concern and that at that level residents will begin to have difficulty parking close to their homes. Anything over 95% represents a situation where full capacity has effectively been reached.</p> <p>The overall conclusion of the report aggregating all the results is that the existing parking stress level is 67.86% and that the additional 6 parking spaces required in connection with the changes to the layout would take this level to 78%, which the Applicant deemed a reasonable level.</p>	Gemma Pannell and John Davies

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>REF. NO</u>	<u>REPRESENTATION FROM</u>	<u>SUMMARY/COMMENTS</u>	<u>CASE OFFICER</u>
			<p>Officer concerns looking at the details of the survey are that the streets closest to the site where there is high demand already and where displaced parking demand would be expected to be greatest are Belle Vue Road and Burroughs Piece Road. Conversely the areas where there is parking capacity is in King Street, which are farthest from the application site and where parking levels are at 57% and 61%. In Belle Vue and Burroughs Piece Roads existing parking stress was measured at 70.37% and 66.67% (Belle Vue) and 85.71% in Burroughs Piece.</p> <p>The results of the survey suggest that the additional displaced parking can be absorbed within the catchment area as a whole, however, in reality the additional parking demand will fall on those streets closest to the site as residents will naturally want to park as close as possible. Belle Vue Road occupancy levels could therefore increase to between 88% to 92% and if only one additional car parked in Burroughs Piece Road it would increase to 100%. These levels would be indicative of severe parking stress.</p>	
1	DC/18/02513	Comments from Highways on Parking Stress Report	<p>I have looked at the Lambeth Methodology and although in principle, it takes on board the mid-week residential parking that occurs overnight, it doesn't look at the commuter and shopping vehicles parking in Belle View Road. The majority of the dwellings on this road do not have off-street parking provision. SCC considers it would be unfair on existing residents to be displaced by occupiers of a new development.</p> <p>Putting the stress on the existing network aside, the parking calculation can be relaxed within an urban environment if sustainable transport is promoted (as Suffolk Parking Guidance). SCC may consider a reduction in the requirement with 1 per place per dwelling with visitor spaces (19+5 = 24) if adequate cycle parking provision is provided with sufficient turning areas for delivery vehicles and sustainable transport is promoted.</p>	

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>REF. NO</u>	<u>REPRESENTATION FROM</u>	<u>SUMMARY/COMMENTS</u>	<u>CASE OFFICER</u>
			However, this approach really only works in major towns and we still consider that the reduced parking for the development will increase the stress on the on-street parking provision and could be detrimental to highway safety.	
1	DC/18/02513	Comments from Occupier of Kimberly, Belle Vue Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plans show Kimberley once again incorrectly drawn - rear of the property is shown smaller than it actually is, making the line of sight measurements incorrect. Also distance of house to the boundary is merely a slab length. <i>Officer Comment- measurements are accurate and distance of side of Kimberly house to Crown site boundary as shown on plan is approx. 6.3m, which corresponds with previous plans and OS plans.</i> Access road to the flats is drawn as a carriageway, showing the pavement removed and does this mean that the on-street parking will be restricted to accommodate this? It has been noted that parking is an issue in Belle Vue Rd. <i>Officer Comment- Existing parking spaces in the road will not be affected.</i> The balcony adjacent to the public footpath will be at a height that makes it possible to touch the cables from the poles that run the length of the property boundary. <i>Officer Comment- Power cables are identified on plans and are responsibility of developer to have regard to in association with relevant utility service i.e. National Power networks. Not a Planning or BC responsibility.</i> Two flats have private patio areas that are visible from the main road, which has not been addressed by the comments from the developer. Both are enclosed by railings making them private spaces. 	Gemma Pannell and John Davies

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>REF. NO</u>	<u>REPRESENTATION FROM</u>	<u>SUMMARY/COMMENTS</u>	<u>CASE OFFICER</u>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporation of studies (and en suite to bedrooms) suggests that the flats are not intended as one bedroom as agreed in the original development with associated exterior works to facilitate this is not merely 'internal rearranging' but a significant change. <i>Officer Comment- see main report</i> The communal roof terrace will cause noise and raises the height of the building on the Belle Vue Rd aspect. This was reduced in the original application to reduce the impact on the street scene. <i>Officer Comment- see main report</i> No plans show the impact of overlooking on the opposite property (Park Hall). <i>Officer Comment- see main report</i> 	
1		Comments from Occupier of Kent House (next to Kimberly), Belle Vue Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consideration should be given to the overall height of the development compared with the surrounding properties and the distance from Kent Villa, Belle Vue Road. <i>Officer Comment- Overall height no different from outline approval.</i> Potential to add an extra apartment over the access ramp to the parking area at the rear of the development which would cause further overlooking <i>Officer Comment- additional flat is not part of application and roof terrace proposed on submitted plans.</i> There are overhead cables running the length of where this balcony would be, within arms length of the owners. <i>Officer Comment- see earlier response</i> The plans for these allegedly one bedroom apartments include a large 'study' with an en suite bathroom to create a two bed roomed property by stealth causing an impact on the parking provided 	

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>REF. NO</u>	<u>REPRESENTATION FROM</u>	<u>SUMMARY/COMMENTS</u>	<u>CASE OFFICER</u>
			<p>and it is therefore likely that the residents would then use Belle which already has parking problems for the current properties. <i>Officer Comment- see main report</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where will the contractors park whilst development takes place, hopefully not Belle Vue Road. <i>Officer Comment- Condition 8 on outline consent required the submission and approval of a Construction Management Methodology to include Details of how construction and worker traffic and parking shall be managed with particular regard to avoiding construction traffic and parking on Belle Vue Road.</i> Could the developer negotiate with the telephone exchange to use their usually empty parking area? <i>Officer Comment- it is not known if any parking land is available on nearby land nor if the owner would be willing to make it available.</i> 	
2	DC/18/00873	Submission from the Applicant (following the Member Panel visit)	<p>"The attached map shows the neighbours in proximity to the site who have made objections vs those houses who haven't.</p> <p>Yellow indicates the neighbours who haven't posted an objection (10 residents), blue indicates those neighbours who objected to the first submission but haven't subsequently (7 residents, 1 holiday home, 1 commercial premises) and red indicates those neighbours who have objected to the first and latest submission (4 residents).</p> <p>Of the 23 residents marked on the map only 3 were in attendance on Wednesday. <i>Officer Comment- submission seeks to show that many residents living closest to the site have not objected. Plan will be included in Officer presentation.</i></p>	Gemma Pannell/John Davies

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>REF. NO</u>	<u>REPRESENTATION FROM</u>	<u>SUMMARY/COMMENTS</u>	<u>CASE OFFICER</u>
			<p>Regarding the other points which were discussed, in particular the lane, it is my understanding that the lane is a legal matter and not a planning matter. Highways haven't raised an objection.</p> <p>I can also confirm that I have a contractual document signed by me, between the owner of the lane and I, which states I will contribute to a fair proportion according to use, of the cost of maintaining and repairing the access track.</p> <p>Regarding the hedge – Commonwealth War Graves (CWG) commented as follows:</p> <p><i>“That a semi-mature Beech hedge is planted in the autumn of 2018 on the boundary edge of the proposed site, immediately to the rear of the commission Cross of Sacrifice. This is to further screen the site and limit noise pollution to any visitors to our graves. The design and layout of this should be agreed in advance with the commission.”</i></p> <p>This should hopefully satisfy the concerns about the height etc.? It's always worth reiterating that the Church and CWG are two separate organisations and neither speaks on behalf of the other.</p> <p>Lastly, I have tried to summarise below what we have previously documented on opening times of the vineyard:</p> <p><i>The Vineyard will be open on a Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Sunday (and bank holidays). The facilities will be operational between the hours of 11:00 to 22:00 through spring and summer and 11:00 to 20:00 in the winter and autumn to accommodate two wine tours and tastings a day in the summer and spring months, reducing this to one tour and tasting on a Saturday and Sunday through winter and autumn. (maximum of 20 guests per tour)</i></p>	

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>REF. NO</u>	<u>REPRESENTATION FROM</u>	<u>SUMMARY/COMMENTS</u>	<u>CASE OFFICER</u>
2		Commonwealth War Graves Commission	<p><i>The applicant doesn't expect demand to fill all available slots through the year but wants to offer flexibility to its customers. Wine tours and tastings are expected to last 2 hours e.g. a tour starts at 12:00 and finishes at 14:00 with a second tour starting at 17:00 finishing at 19:00. This gives us plenty of time to have the first tour off site before second tour arrives.</i></p> <p><i>All bookings (glamping and vineyard) will be pre-booked online via a secure website, which will include information about arrival / departure times allowing the applicant to timebox visitors on site, as well as manage visitor numbers and logistics, coordinating with events being held at the church or at the commonwealth war graves.</i></p> <p><i>The site will not be open for members of the public to access without pre-booking, this will be made very clear on our social media pages and website."</i></p> <p>Key commemorative and remembrance dates in the UK are as follows: 11 November – Remembrance Day Remembrance Sunday (November) 25 April - Anzac Day ANZAC Sunday (April)</p>	
2		Councillor Peter Patrick	<p>'Chairman and members. I apologise for not being able to make this submission in person.</p> <p>I wish to support Mr Mills' application for works at the vineyard in Frogs Alley at Shotley. The item was called before the Committee because a) there were a number of objectors; and b) the site is in the AONB.</p> <p>I will not attempt to answer all the objections but can deal with some main themes:</p>	

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>REF. NO</u>	<u>REPRESENTATION FROM</u>	<u>SUMMARY/COMMENTS</u>	<u>CASE OFFICER</u>
			<p>1. Access</p> <p>The lanes to Shotley church and thence to the vineyard are narrow. This has not prevented the PCC of St Mary's inviting, via its attractive website, people to hold their weddings at the church. The website shows a church full of wedding guests; I imagine they drove there.</p> <p>My wife and I attended a service organised by the Royal British Legion at the church in 2015. It was well-attended. We travelled safely.</p> <p>2. The Cemetery</p> <p>My family are sailors by tradition, my father having served in the Royal Navy from 1937/8 until 1953. When the Royal Navy were attempting to persuade the French fleet at Oran to surrender, my father sent the message to the French Admiral. At Mers-el-Kebir, the Navy tried to ram the harbour boom. My father's best pal was on board the vessel charged with the task. He was machine-gunned in the water. I carry his surname as my middle name.</p> <p>My maternal grand-mother's brother was drowned in a submarine accident before the First World War. A nice-looking lad.</p> <p>I know about loss. When I pay my respects at the cemetery I'm usually the only one there. I have, however, attended a Remembrance service with the children from the Primary School, who hold part of their devotions at the Submariners cemetery. It is very moving, and how it should be. But life goes on during the rest of the year. At Boxford our Remembrance Service is packed, but the children at the Primary School next door are not expected to comport themselves in silence during the rest of the year, despite the presence of a Commonwealth War Grave.</p>	

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>REF. NO</u>	<u>REPRESENTATION FROM</u>	<u>SUMMARY/COMMENTS</u>	<u>CASE OFFICER</u>
			<p>The War Graves Commission have agreed the presence of a marquee in the field next to the WWII Cemetery under certain conditions. Mr Mills accepts that six events is an upper limit and not a target.</p> <p>3. The AONB</p> <p>I have had particular discussions with Simon Amstutz, head of the local AONB. He assures me that his staff have been careful in gauging the impact of the proposed building in particular, and he is content, in light of adjustments made by Mr Mills, that no objection can now be raised.</p> <p>The local AONB is a valuable resource, as are the local walks. One cannot, however, avoid the presence over the water of Felixstowe docks with the enormous cranes, and the sound of engines running. It is not the same as the Lake District.</p> <p>4. The Vineyard</p> <p>Our various Planning guidelines encourage agricultural activity. I would hope that we can accept that running a vineyard is just such, albeit that it is relatively unusual. The vines are maturing nicely and it is not unreasonable, in my view, to wish to exploit them. That may mean inviting the public to tastings – a normal activity – and it is clear that Mr Hills will regulate such access to avoid nuisance.</p> <p>A helpful member of the Parish Council wrote in favour of encouraging enterprise, but just not here. Sorry, but this is where the vineyard is. It is perfectly feasible that someone will find the time to start up a campaign on social media to have the vineyard ploughed up, to remove the source of the problem, but I think that would be excessive.</p>	

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>REF. NO</u>	<u>REPRESENTATION FROM</u>	<u>SUMMARY/COMMENTS</u>	<u>CASE OFFICER</u>
2		Errata	<p>5. Enterprise</p> <p>I would submit, Chairman, that it would be retrograde to turn down an attempt at enterprise in this location on this scale. There is a risk of sending a message that Babergh DC is only interested in encouraging commercial activity in Sudbury and Hadleigh, leaving the rest of the District as a glorified retirement home. Nor should we be attempting to deter competition. I was obliged to hold my daughter's wedding reception in a marquee on a local farm – everywhere else was booked up. Fortunately it worked brilliantly, and I would hope that Mr Mills can achieve similar results.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to accept the Application. Thank you.</p> <p>Peter Patrick Cllr Berners Ward'</p> <p>Para 8.5:</p> <p>The location of the proposed outbuilding is approximately 260m from the Church and at a much lower level with significant intervening tree and hedgerow screening. Therefore, views of the structure from the Church would be very limited and whilst it is acknowledge that the setting of a listed building comprises more than just visual impact, it is considered in this case that less than substantial harm identified by the Heritage Team is outweighed by public benefits.....</p>	
3	B/17/01069	Richard Aspa (Objector)	<p>Less than substantial harm is a poor justification for the street lights which will have a significant impact on the medieval streetscape. Responses from heritage professionals are universally negative. The general public is unaware of the strong objections to Suffolk highways lighting. Life expectancy of the lights is likely to be 20+ years. Lavenham deserves lights which are appropriate to their setting.</p>	Samantha Summers

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>REF. NO</u>	<u>REPRESENTATION FROM</u>	<u>SUMMARY/COMMENTS</u>	<u>CASE OFFICER</u>
3		Councillor William Shropshire	<p>I send this note in support of the Lavenham PC application to retain the installed LED street lighting at 11 Market Place Lavenham, and request that this letter of support is read out at the meeting, or is passed to all committee members prior to the meeting to allow them time to read and that it is acknowledged in the minutes of the meeting that all councillors on the committee have read my letter of support:</p> <p>“As district councillor for Lavenham Ward, I write to support and endorse the application by Lavenham PC to keep the already erected LED street light in market place, Lavenham.</p> <p>My support is based on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The lights/units are unobtrusive and representative of the current age. An ‘older style’ choice begs the question of what period should be adopted, Victorian lamp style lights are in contrast to the timber frame of medieval Lavenham (some 300/400 years apart) and 1980 metal frame street lights are certainly more obtrusive and would be even worse. Therefore the LED whilst unnoticeable does at least bring a sense of the modern dimension to the story and many examples of different ages in Lavenham. 2. These same style lights are used extensively across the County and within Conservation Areas - the officer report touches on this at paragraph 4.4, the total number of units is some 3,400 plus in the UK. 3. Lavenham is a progressive village, examples include being the first village in Babergh to have an adopted Neighbourhood Plan, throughout the late 20th and early 21st century Lavenham has supported house building and provided support for community led housing (including CLT support and 18 affordable houses in process) and very recently the village acquired the operation of 2 Lady Street for Tourist Info Centre and community Hub – in short Lavenham moves with the ages which may be one of its greatest strengths and these lights allow that. 	

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>REF. NO</u>	<u>REPRESENTATION FROM</u>	<u>SUMMARY/COMMENTS</u>	<u>CASE OFFICER</u>
			<p>4. In the initial exchanges Heritage offered no objection, it was only once someone complained that they decided to make an issue of this.</p> <p>5. It has support of Babergh planning team</p> <p>I do hope the committee will see the great benefit these lights bring and the understanding that no artificial light is the correct style for Lavenham and as such we should use a modern unobtrusive and subtle design such as that already in situ and proposed.</p>	

P:\MSDC\Governance\DOCS\Committee\REPORTS\Planning Committee\2018\2018-10-17\Addendum 17 October 2018.docx