

Consultee Comments for Planning Application DC/19/00336

Application Summary

Application Number: DC/19/00336

Address: Bell Hill Cottage And The Newsagent The Street Rickingham Inferior IP22 1BN

Proposal: Planning Application. Change of Use of ground floor to A5 Hot Food Takeaway.

Installation of extract equipment internally and flue through roof. Internal alterations to provide sound and fire-proofing to party walls and floors.

Case Officer: Sian Bunbury

Consultee Details

Name: Mrs Leeann Jackson-Eve

Address: Wayside, Cherry Tree Lane, Botesdale Diss, Suffolk IP22 1DL

Email: botesdale_pc@btopenworld.com

On Behalf Of: Botesdale Parish Clerk

Comments

Botesdale Parish Council considered this new application for a takeaway at the site of the former post office and noted that it has addressed few of the concerns voiced in reply to the two previous applications. Many of these address errors of fact and incorrect assumptions, and they are still relevant. They are included below.

The premises are now a thriving shop and family home, a use which has not had the effect on residential amenity, i.e. noise, litter, fumes, inconsiderate parking and increased traffic, which the proposed hot food takeaway would have. The current occupants have exposed new heritage features which are not referred to in the current application.

There is still significant concern about parking and traffic. The volume of traffic and parking issues were not acceptable when it was a Post Office/Newsagent; there were regular complaints about inconsiderate parking and pedestrian safety and these concerns have not been addressed at all in the application. There is insufficient parking for four employees, delivery drivers and customers as well as the residents who rely on on-street parking or do not wish to see their driveways blocked. The applicant includes photographs which either show driveways or occupied spaces an almost constant state during late afternoon and evening hours. There is no turning space to manoeuvre vehicles. Parking on and obstructing pavements happened frequently when it was a Post Office, and this will not miraculously go away if it becomes a takeaway. The assessment by Highways is cursory and is based on standards which might be acceptable and expected in a town centre, but not a village.

Parking/traffic and the added noise, odour and litter would have an unfortunate effect on residential amenity beyond the adjoining neighbour and the Parish Council objects to this

application for those and the reasons set out below. The District Council consults parish councils for their local knowledge; it would be encouraging to see that taken into account.

The Newsagent, Bell Hill Cottage, Rickingham - DC/18/01379

There is considerable local opposition to the application as evidenced by the number of individual comments, and they are consistent in raising the issues of fumes and odour, and of the effect of traffic and parking.

The opposing residents all emphasise the traffic and parking issues currently encountered with the existing businesses, and specifically with the previous use as a post office. The fact that the proposed business would generate a comparable level of traffic to the previous use does not make it acceptable. Residents are only too aware of the road safety and pedestrian safety issues which occurred during the use of the premises as a Post Office and consider that a return to those conditions would be unacceptable.

The loss of residential space to allow the applicant to relocate the A5 use is not to be encouraged when there is a shortage of housing.

The Newsagent, Bell Hill Cottage, Rickingham - DC/17/04483

The Parish Council noted that there are many inaccuracies in the Planning Statement as well as information which is misleadingly presented and/or incomplete. This has resulted in an application which is not well thought out and is based on assumptions which are not appropriate for the proposed site. The following are the most significant.

The premises are described as a former Newsagent but, until it closed last year, its main function was as a full-time Post Office. The change of use will make the loss of a much-needed service permanent.

The applicant states that there is sufficient on-street parking for customers and employees. The reality is that there is barely enough on-street parking for residents, as is routinely illustrated by the multiple vehicles parked on the pavements whilst customers visit other food outlets. Both photos included to illustrate the available parking show gaps which are driveways to multiple residences (the keep clear markings are clearly visible).

No evidence is provided to support the statement that 50% of orders will normally be collected on foot. Botesdale and Rickingham form a very linear community and the reality is that those at either end will drive in order to keep their food hot.

The applicant states that it will benefit the vitality and viability of the centre. However, it would be in direct competition with three existing businesses nearby which already provide the same service (pizza) and have recently made substantial investment to do so. Any loss of trade by those businesses will directly affect existing local employment.

The Mid Suffolk approach to sustainable development requires that proposals must actively

conserve and enhance the local character and this has not been addressed within the application (Policy FC1.1).

The proposal for extended trading hours beyond those of the Post Office will materially reduce the amenity and privacy of adjacent dwellings, without consideration of the noise and exhaust fumes from the extraction system, and the inevitable increase in litter and late night gathering by customers will erode the residential character of the surrounding area (Policy H16).

The proposal makes no provision for parking and manoeuvring of vehicles in accordance with parking standards and is entirely reliant on the use of residents parking opposite for a significant number of regular attendees including staff, delivery vehicles and residents of the flat above, before customers are even taken into account. This will lead to unsafe and antisocial parking in front of the shop and nearby residences and, contrary to the statement in the application, it is a significant material concern. (Policy T9)

Supplementary Planning Guidance on the Retention of Shops, Post Offices and Public Houses in Villages aims to encourage the retention of rural services; ensure that proposals for changes of use are properly justified; and to enable reopening of services or facilities at a future stage by resisting specific building alterations that would prevent reopening. This proposal meets none of those aims.

Finally, Public Health Englands guidance on Health Matters identifies the relationship between the proliferation of fast food outlets and obesity. It recommends that planning policies control the over-concentration and proliferation of hot food takeaways as part of plans to tackle obesity.

The picture presented is of an application in which the adverse impacts the loss of a site for a permanent post office; the loss of amenity in a residential area due to increased noise, odour and litter; further exposure to an unhealthy food environment; the effect on existing businesses; and additional strain on already strained on-street parking far outweigh the benefits, of which there is no evidence in the application. (Policy FC1 Core Strategy Focused Review)

Consultee Comments for Planning Application DC/19/00336

Application Summary

Application Number: DC/19/00336

Address: Bell Hill Cottage And The Newsagent The Street Rickinghall Inferior IP22 1BN

Proposal: Planning Application. Change of Use of ground floor to A5 Hot Food Takeaway.

Installation of extract equipment internally and flue through roof. Internal alterations to provide sound and fire-proofing to party walls and floors.

Case Officer: Sian Bunbury

Consultee Details

Name: Mrs Leeann Jackson-Eve

Address: Wayside, Cherry Tree Lane, Botesdale Diss, Suffolk IP22 1DL

Email: rickinghall_pc@btopenworld.com

On Behalf Of: Rickinghall Superior And Inferior Parish Clerk

Comments

Rickinghall Parish Council still objects to this application as most of the concerns remain unaddressed, particularly the issues relating to parking and residential amenity. The sites current use as an antiques shop adds to the variety of businesses within the village and is well-supported with daytime shop opening hours and a high proportion of pedestrian trade. It also maintains the 3-bedroom family accommodation which is much needed within the village.

It is incorrect to say that the only dwelling impacted by the proposal is the adjoining one or that noise, fumes and litter are acceptable due to the proximity of The Bell Inn public house. The proposals are likely to generate additional noise, fumes and litter to an unacceptable level and their impact cannot be compared to that of similar related businesses [which] can be seen in neighbouring market towns. Rickinghall is not a market town it is a village in which most of the buildings are residential, with a very small number of businesses. Every dwelling within that section of The Street would be affected by these issues and the entire village(s) would be affected by the increased traffic and parking problems. It is disingenuous to say otherwise.

It is disheartening to see how little notice the local authorities, particularly Highways, take of local knowledge and information. Botesdale and Rickinghall are currently struggling under the weight of traffic and parking issues and are fighting to prevent it from becoming worse. In applying standards which are more appropriate for town centres, the authorities do villages a disservice.

The Newsagent, Bell Hill Cottage, Rickinghall - DC/18/01379

The Parish Council strongly objects to this application and we refer you to our comments on application DC/17/04483 below, which we would like you to consider in relation to the new

application. We would reiterate that the information about the extraction system is still woefully inadequate and any consideration of this application should be delayed until that is properly addressed. Furthermore, our objections relating to parking have not been addressed in the new application and we would request that Highways carry out a parking survey, as they did in Eye when the applicant applied for similar premises. The lack of parking was a significant issue for the Newsagent/Post Office to the extent that the Parish Council applied to have bollards placed to prevent parking on the pavement in front of the shop as it threatened the safety of pedestrians and prevented pushchairs, etc from passing. The results of a traffic survey, which went to every household in 2016, showed that 67% of residents supported the bollards.

In addition to our previous comments, we would add that the loss of residential space is contrary to the current aim to increase the housing stock within Mid-Suffolk and should not be encouraged.

The Newsagent, Bell Hill Cottage, Rickingham - DC/17/04483

Rickingham Parish Council received a substantial number of objections to this application, both in writing and at its meeting on 5 October. Residents feel very strongly that the application is misleading in a deliberate attempt to downplay the impact on Botesdale and Rickingham (the village) and exaggerate the potential for trade at that location. The village is repeatedly referred to as a town and the location of the shop a retail centre, conjuring up an image of abundant public parking, plentiful foot traffic and a bustling shopping area. This could not be further from the truth. Although Botesdale and Rickingham are, together, a key service centre, they still retain a village feel with a handful of long-established retail premises in a predominantly residential community.

Of particular concern is the assertion that there is sufficient on street parking for customers and workers. In 2016 Botesdale and Rickingham undertook a traffic survey in the village, the results of which highlighted the problems of parking at the Newsagent/Post Office, specifically the frequency with which customers parked on the pavement in front of the shop and the adjoining Bell Hill House. As the result of several incidences reported to the Parish Council, in which customers were nearly hit as they descended the steps onto the pavement, bollards were proposed with the support of 67% of survey respondents. Customers regularly blocked nearby drives to the point where in 2016 Botesdale Parish Council pursued a Keep Clear marking for Warrens Lane, opposite. This reflected a general shortage of public parking in the village, as does the line of cars regularly parked on the pavement of the market place opposite the existing takeaways. As the parking opposite is mainly used by residents, it is unlikely that it will be able to accommodate vehicles for staff, the residents of the 2-bedroom flat above and customers. The planning statement does not even take into account the delivery vehicles which would be necessary to make up for the lack of foot traffic. There is no evidence to support the assertion that 50% of customers will arrive by foot; as Botesdale and Rickingham form a long, linear community and most people like to eat their takeaway hot, it is very likely that residents from either end will drive to collect their food. It should be noted that there is nowhere for customers and delivery drivers to turn around except for driveways and the pub car park, neither of which is acceptable.

The conclusion is that the proposals do not meet the standards for providing parking and manoeuvring of vehicles. (Policy T9)

An equal concern is the effect on residential amenity, particularly to the residents of Bell Hill House which adjoins on both levels with a flying freehold directly above the shop. This was acceptable when the shop was a quiet newsagent/post office with daytime hours but will be intolerable to the residents with the proposed opening hours of 11am to 10pm and this is no doubt the reason that pre-application advice from the planning officer was for a closing time of 9pm. That advice has been completely ignored by the applicant, giving some indication of how committed they are to protecting residents from any negative effects of the proposed business. It is felt that the combination of noise and fumes from the extraction system, risk of fire, noise from customers and the inevitable increase in litter will significantly reduce the amenity and privacy of nearby residents and will erode the character of the surrounding area. (Policy H16)

Any study of this application should include consideration of the loss of the Post Office. Although, the application describes the previous use as a Newsagent, it was in fact a permanent, full-time post office and the loss of this service to a rural community is considerable. Supplementary Planning Guidance on Retention of Shops, Post Offices and Public Houses in Villages strongly encourages not only the retention of rural services, but support for resisting alterations that would prevent reopening and demands that proposals for change of use are properly justified. The applicant has made no case in this respect. Although both parish councils have been pursuing a replacement since it closed last summer, they have so far been unable to find alternative arrangements.

The impact on public health must also be considered. Public Health England provides guidance on Obesity and the Built Environment which links obesity with the proliferation of fast food outlets. The NHS urges planning authorities to manage the impact of hot food takeaways in proximity to schools and it should be noted that there are four existing takeaway businesses within sight of this shop.

Finally, the applicant states that a pizza takeaway will benefit the vitality and viability of the centre. It is hard to imagine how it will do more to benefit the village than the three existing businesses nearby which already provide takeaway pizza and have only recently invested heavily to expand their trade in this direction. Any loss of trade by those businesses will directly affect existing local employment.

Policy FC1 states that permission will not be granted if any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. Furthermore, Policy FC1.1 requires that proposals should actively conserve and enhance the local character. This application neglects consideration of any benefits of the proposal and provides no evidence of any enhancements to the local character. It is not, in fact, evident how either could be accomplished with this proposal. However, the adverse impacts are abundantly clear and the Parish Council therefore objects to

the application.



Consultation Response

1	Application Number	DC/19/0336 Rickinghall Inferior	
2	Date of Response	25/01/2019	
3	Responding Officer	Name:	Dawn Easter
		Job Title:	Economic Development Officer
		Responding on behalf of...	Economic Development & Tourism
4	Recommendation Note: This section must be completed before the response is sent. The recommendation should be based on the information submitted with the application.	No objection	
5	Discussion Please outline the reasons/rationale behind how you have formed the recommendation. Please refer to any guidance, policy or material considerations that have informed your recommendation.	<p>The premises are easily accessible and located in the main street of the village, close to other pubs and shops and on-street parking.</p> <p>The application will retain the ground floor for commercial use and help to support four new jobs.</p>	
6	Amendments, Clarification or Additional Information Required (if holding objection) if concerns are raised, can they be overcome with changes? Please ensure any requests are proportionate		
7	Recommended conditions		

Please note that this form can be submitted electronically on the Councils website. Comments submitted on the website will not be acknowledged but you can check whether they have been received by reviewing comments on the website under the application reference number. Please note that the completed form will be posted on the Councils website and available to view by the public.

From: Nathan Pittam <Nathan.Pittam@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>
Sent: 25 January 2019 09:27
To: Sian Bunbury <Sian.Bunbury@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>
Cc: BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow <planningyellow@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>
Subject: DC/19/00336. Land Contamination

Dear Sian

EP Reference : 254607

DC/19/00336. Land Contamination

Bell Hill Cottage, The Street, Rickingham Inferior, DISS, IP22 1BN.

Change of Use of ground floor to A5 Hot Food Takeaway. Installation of extract equipment internally and flue through roof. Internal alterations to provide sound and fire-proofing to party walls and floors.

Many thanks for your request for comments in relation to the above application. I can confirm that I have no objection to the proposed development from the perspective of land contamination

Kind regards

Nathan

Nathan Pittam BSc. (Hons.) PhD
Senior Environmental Management Officer

Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils – Working Together

Email: Nathan.pittam@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

Work: 07769 566988 / 01449 724715

websites: www.babergh.gov.uk www.midsuffolk.gov.uk



Click here

to tell us what you think
of our draft
Communities Strategy.
Our consultation
will close at **12pm**
on **1 March 2019**



From: David Harrold <David.Harrold@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>

Sent: 01 April 2019 10:52

To: BMSDC Planning Mailbox <planning@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>

Cc: Sian Bunbury <Sian.Bunbury@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>

Subject: Plan ref DC/19/00336 Bell Hill Cottage/Newsagent, The Street, Rickinghall Inferior. EH - Noise/Odour/Light/Smoke

Thank you for consulting me on the above application and further information received in respect of kitchen ventilation.

I can confirm with respect to noise and other environment health issues that I do not have any objection to the proposed development providing:

1. Additional sound proofing below the existing shop ceiling and party walls (ground floor) are provided with neighbouring residential premise, as per drawings and specification submitted by the applicant.
2. Grease and carbon filters are installed together with noise attenuators to the internal ducting of the ventilation flue as per the details submitted and Planning Statement by Roberts Malloy Associates dated January 2019.

I trust this is advice is of assistance.

David Harrold MCIEH
Senior Environmental Health Officer

Babergh & Midsuffolk District Councils
t: 01449 724718
e: david.harrold@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

Your Ref:DC/19/00336
Our Ref: SCC/CON/0311/19
Date: 12 February 2019



All planning enquiries should be sent to the Local Planning Authority.

Email: planning@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

The Planning Department
MidSuffolk District Council
Planning Section
1st Floor, Endeavour House
8 Russell Road
Ipswich
Suffolk
IP1 2BX

For the attention of: Sian Bunbury

Dear Sian

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
CONSULTATION RETURN: DC/19/00336**

PROPOSAL: Planning Application. Change of Use of ground floor to A5 Hot Food Takeaway. Installation of extract equipment internally and flue through roof. Internal alterations to provide sound and fire-proofing to party walls and floors.

LOCATION: Bell Hill Cottage And The Newsagent The Street Rickinghall IP22 1BN

Notice is hereby given that the County Council as Highway Authority make the following comments:

Section 13 of the application form, Vehicle Parking, states that vehicle parking is not relevant to the proposal, which is incorrect. Therefore, vehicle parking information should be provided to ensure the site complies with Suffolk Guidance for Parking 2015.

If this information is either not provided or deemed insufficient, SCC would be forced to object to DC/19/00336.

Yours sincerely,

Kyle Porter
Development Management Technician
Growth, Highways and Infrastructure

Mid Suffolk District Council
Endeavour House
Russell Road
Ipswich
IP1 2BX

Fire Business Support Team
Floor 3, Block 2
Endeavour House
8 Russell Road
Ipswich, Suffolk
IP1 2BX

Your Ref:
Our Ref: FS/F190985
Enquiries to: Water Officer
Direct Line: 01473 260588
E-mail: Fire.BusinessSupport@suffolk.gov.uk
Web Address: <http://www.suffolk.gov.uk>

Date: 12/02/2019

Dear Sir/Madam

Bell Hill Cottage, The Newsagent, The Street, Rickinghall Inferior IP22 1BN
Planning Application No: DC/19/00336

I refer to the above application.

The plans have been inspected by the Water Officer who has the following comments to make.

Access and Fire Fighting Facilities

Access to buildings for fire appliances and firefighters must meet with the requirements specified in Building Regulations Approved Document B, (Fire Safety), 2006 Edition, incorporating 2010 and 2013 amendments Volume 1 - Part B5, Section 11 dwelling houses, and, similarly, Volume 2, Part B5, Sections 16 and 17 in the case of buildings other than dwelling houses. These requirements may be satisfied with other equivalent standards relating to access for firefighting, in which case those standards should be quoted in correspondence.

Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service also requires a minimum carrying capacity for hard standing for pumping/high reach appliances of 15/26 tonnes, not 12.5 tonnes as detailed in the Building Regulations 2000 Approved Document B, 2006 Edition, incorporating 2010 and 2013 amendments.

Water Supplies

No additional water supply for firefighting purposes is required in respect of this planning application. Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service recommends that proper consideration be given to the potential life safety, economic, environmental and social benefits derived from the provision of an automatic fire sprinkler system. (Please see sprinkler information enclosed with this letter).

OFFICIAL

Consultation should be made with the Water Authorities to determine flow rates in all cases.

Should you need any further advice or information on access and firefighting facilities, you are advised to contact your local Building Control in the first instance. For further advice and information regarding water supplies, please contact the Water Officer at the above headquarters.

Yours faithfully

Water Officer

Water Officer
Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service

c.c. Mrs Sarah Roberts
Roberts Molloy Architects and Consultants

Chloe@robertsmolloy.co.uk

Enc. Sprinkler Letter



Historic England

EAST OF ENGLAND OFFICE

Ms Sian Bunbury
Mid Suffolk District Council
Endeavour House
8 Russell Road
IPSWICH
Suffolk
IP1 2BX

Direct Dial: 01223 582711

Our ref: **W:** L01028242

28 January 2019

Dear Ms Bunbury

Arrangements for Handling Heritage Applications Direction 2015

**BELL HILL COTTAGE AND THE NEWSAGENT, THE STREET, RICKINGHALL
INFERIOR, IP22 1BN**

Application No. DC/19/00336

Thank you for your letter of 24 January 2019 regarding the above application for listed building consent. On the basis of the information available to date, we do not wish to offer any comments. We suggest that you seek the views of your specialist conservation adviser.

It is not necessary for us to be consulted on this application again, unless there are material changes to the proposals. However, if you would like detailed advice from us, please contact us to explain your request.

Yours sincerely

Joanne Robinson

Business Officer

E-mail: Joanne.Robinson@HistoricEngland.org.uk



24 BROOKLANDS AVENUE, CAMBRIDGE, CB2 8BU

Telephone 01223 582749
HistoricEngland.org.uk



From: Kyle Porter
Sent: 01 March 2019 10:02
To: Chloe | Roberts Molloy Associates; Sian Bunbury
Subject: RE: DC/19/00336 Rickinghall, The Street

Apologies both for not getting back to you sooner.

On the premise that parking provisions are no different to that which was both previously approved & previously existing, SCC would not wish to raise an objection.

Thanks for your patience on the matter, it is appreciated.

Kind regards,

Kyle