

## Rebecca Biggs

---

**From:** David Harrold  
**Sent:** 08 January 2018 11:18  
**To:** Rebecca Biggs  
**Subject:** RE: DC/17/04483 and DC/17/04484

Hi Rebecca,

Re points 20 – 25 of the letter, it is correct that to aid dispersion of residual odour (after filtration) it is recommended that this is at or above ridge height but this is not critical or the only factor I have taken into account. As the predominant wind direction will take residual odour away from Bell Hill House and there are no windows in the roof (as far as I am aware) this should be satisfactory providing the usual grease and carbon filters are incorporated into the design. There is no definitive methodology to calculate this type of flue height for kitchen ventilation, only unofficial guidance/good practice.


I've attached a diagram below which shows the relationship of ridge height for chimneys and flues in the Building Regulations. The further away from the ridge you go the lower the discharge height can be.

As per my response, I do not object providing filtration and silencing equipment is installed. This could be made a condition on any approval given.

The second matter is more difficult, in the absence of any information from a competent person I would not be able to advise on the adequacy of sound insulation between the premises other than old and timber frame building can be very poor due to the historic methods of construction and materials used. Perhaps we could discuss this. I intend to be in Endeavour House from tomorrow onwards. Feel free to look at my electronic diary and put in an appointment – no need to book meeting room, use break out area.

David

**Diagram 2 Flue or Chimney Outlet Highlighting Unsafe Shaded Area**



The height of the chimney or flue will be determined by the pitch of the roof. Table 2 offers an indication of the different flue and chimney stack heights necessary to give the mandatory required roof clearances when the flue or chimney exit point is beyond 600mm of the ridge.

---

**From:** Rebecca Biggs  
**Sent:** 03 January 2018 17:11  
**To:** David Harrold  
**Subject:** DC/17/04483 and DC/17/04484

Dear David,

You kindly responded to the consultation to the above applications relating to the change of use of the shop and part of the existing residential unit to a hot food takeaway. I would be grateful for your further guidance following further information from neighbours. Please see the attached email which has a letter from the neighbours solicitor regarding the applications DC/17/04483 (Full PP) and DC/17/04484 (LBC). The solicitor has raised concerns regarding the flue and impact on the attached property, Bell Hill House and whether Environmental Health have considered this impact in their response. The flue is approximately 0.4m above the ridge height of the roof slope it protrudes from and is lower than the ridge height of Bell Hill House. I would be really grateful if you could consider points 20-25 of the letter and let me know your thoughts by next Friday.

In addition, I have confirmed with building control that the change of use of a shop to hot food takeaway would not require approval in terms of building regulations. As such, a false ceiling for fire safety and sound proofing is not necessary from building regulations. The provision of the false ceiling would conceal the original ceiling and would involve screwing metal fixtures into the original joists. Given this impact on the heritage asset. I would welcome your thoughts on whether the false ceiling is necessary in terms of neighbour amenity and as such if this false ceiling could be removed from the proposal. I do not think there is an alternative method as this would involve the removal of historic fabric. However they could consider insulating the floorboards above but this would require the agreement of the neighbours who object to the development and would unlikely agree to the lifting of the

floorboards to facilitate the change of use. I would be happy to discuss this second matter with you rather than wait for a response by next Friday.

Many thanks

**Rebecca Biggs**

Principal Planning Officer  
Babergh and Mid-Suffolk District Councils- WorkingTogether  
Endeavour House, 8 Russell Road, Ipswich IP1 2BX  
Mobile: 07860827084  
Email: [rebecca.biggs@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:rebecca.biggs@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk)  
[www.babergh.gov.uk](http://www.babergh.gov.uk) or [www.midsuffolk.gov.uk](http://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk)

*Please be advised that any comments expressed in this email are offered as a informal professional opinion unless otherwise stated and are given without prejudice to any decision or action the Council may take in the future. Please check with the email's author if you are in any doubt about the status of the content of this email. Any personal information contained in correspondence shall be dealt with in accordance with Mid Suffolk and Babergh District Council's Data Protection policy and the provisions of the Data Protection Act as found on both Council's websites.*

[Click Here](#) for the latest planning news and changes to the service coming up this year





## Consultation Response Pro forma

<b>1</b>	<b>Application Number</b>	DC/17/04483 DC/17/04484 Bell Hill Cottage, The Street, Rickinghall	
<b>2</b>	<b>Date of Response</b>	03/11/2017	
<b>3</b>	<b>Responding Officer</b>	Name:	Rebecca Styles
		Job Title:	Heritage Officer
		Responding on behalf of...	Heritage
<b>4</b>	<b>Summary and Recommendation</b> (please delete those N/A)  Note: This section must be completed before the response is sent. The recommendation should be based on the information submitted with the application.	<p>1. The Heritage Team considers that the documentation submitted in support of this application falls below the requirements of paragraph 128 of the NPPF, as no assessment of the impact of the proposed work on the listed building has been made. The Heritage team is not opposed to the change of use, however does have concerns regarding the necessity and justification of the proposed internal works through introduction of fire lining/suspended ceiling and the possible effect on the internal character of the Grade II listed Bell Hill Cottage.</p>	
<b>5</b>	<b>Discussion</b> 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>These applications seek planning permission and listed building consent for the change of use of the Grade II listed Bell Hill Cottage from A1 to A5, erection of a metal flue and internal fire lining.</p> <p>Bell Hill Cottage is located in the Rickinghall and Botesdale Conservation Area, and is a C16th GII listed timber framed building with plain tile roof with later alterations. The building is located on the main drag through Rickinghall, and positively contributes to the character of the area.</p> <p>The Heritage team does not oppose the proposed change of use of the building from A1 to A5, however does have concerns regarding the internal work proposed. For example, it is proposed to fire line the party wall shared with the proposed front of house/waiting area, install a suspended ceiling, and fire line first floor party wall.</p> <p>The Heritage Statement submitted with this application is particularly brief, and does not include justification or mitigation for the proposed works, despite stating that the proposed works <u>will</u> affect the historic fabric or the character of the building. The Heritage Statement also fails to assess the significance of the listed building, and falls below the requirements of paragraph 128 of the NPPF. For example, whilst the building is timber framed, it is unclear whether the frame is expressed internally, whether the frame is lath and plastered, or if modern</p>	

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.

		<p>plasterboard has been installed on the walls or ceilings. This information should have been included in the Heritage Statement, and depending how the rooms are internally finished, the level of harm which the fire lining may cause to the character of the building may differ. This should be clarified.</p> <p>The Heritage team does not oppose the introduction of the flue in the roof slope of the east elevation. The proposed flue would be installed in a later, though still historic, addition to the listed building, however would avoid projecting far above the ridge and is of a modest scale so should avoid a too conspicuous appearance. The building features a large central chimney, whilst the western elevation of the building features an external stack. Whilst the flue would read as a modern introduction, it is not considered that the flue would harm the character of Bell Hill Cottage, or the significance of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The Heritage team is currently unable to support this application and recommends further information is submitted regarding the internal finish of the building.</p>
6	<p><b>Amendments, Clarification or Additional Information Required</b> (if holding objection)</p> <p>If concerns are raised, can they be overcome with changes? Please ensure any requests are proportionate</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Justification regarding proposed internal lining and further assessment of existing internal finishes and of impact on internal character of space to be submitted.</li> </ul>
7	<p><b>Recommended conditions</b></p>	<p>Notwithstanding the above comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Flue to be painted black</li> </ul> <p>Recommended note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Listed building consent would be required for any alterations to signage, and should be sought prior to the display of any new advertisement(s).</li> </ul>

Please note that this form can be submitted electronically on the Council's 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 Council's website and available to view by the public.

# BOTESDALE PARISH COUNCIL

Wayside Cottage ~ Cherry Tree Lane ~ Botesdale ~ Diss ~ IP22 1DL

Tel: 01379 890141

Email: botesdale\_pc@btopenworld.com

Ms Rebecca Biggs  
Growth and Sustainable Planning  
Mid Suffolk District Council

5 October 2017

Dear Ms Biggs

## **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.

### Section 1:

- 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).

### Section 2:

- The proposed location is described as a Town Centre. The applicant's other outlets are in town centres, with plenty of nearby car parks. Botesdale and Rickingham is a village with no public car park and existing issues with traffic and parking.

### Section 3:

- The pre-planning advice concerning opening hours is inconsistently applied, i.e. a closing time of 9pm was advised and the applicant presents that as 10pm on Friday/Saturday and 9pm other nights, relaxing it further on in the application to 11am – 10pm.

### Section 4:

- The ventilation, filtration and odour control system is not adequately described in the statement. Examples of components which may or may not be appropriate is not sufficient to make informed comment. This is particularly vital given its location in a residential area and the unillustrated impact on the Listed building.
- 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.

### Section 5-6:

- The villages are again referred to as a "market town" or "historic town" both implying a potential for trade which may not exist and downplaying the impact both on traffic/parking and the existing businesses. This is not a retail centre in a town, but a residential area with a scattering of commercial properties.

### Section 9:

- 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). In fact, the addition of a large ventilation system through the roof will have a detrimental effect on a key element of local character – the line of rooftops viewed from the top of Crown Hill to Maypole Meadow.

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 England's 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 effect on the Listed building is addressed in the PC's comments on application DC/17/04484.

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)

Yours sincerely

Leeann Jackson-Eve  
Parish Clerk

**From:**David Harrold

**Sent:**7 Sep 2017 11:45:23 +0100

**To:**BMSDC Planning Mailbox

**Cc:**Rebecca Biggs

**Subject:**Plan ref DC/17/04483 Bell Hill Cottage, The Street, Rickinghall. EH - Land Contamination.

Thank you for consulting me on the above application for part change of use to form a hot food takeaway.

In respect of land contamination I do not have any comments to make and no objection to the proposal.

David Harrold MCIEH

Senior Environmental Health Officer

Babergh and Mid Suffolk Council



**From:**David Harrold

**Sent:**25 Sep 2017 12:33:15 +0100

**To:**BMSDC Planning Mailbox

**Cc:**Rebecca Biggs

**Subject:**Plan ref DC/17/04483 Bell Hill Cottage, The Street, Rickingham Inferior. EH - Noise/Odour/Smoke/Light

Thank you for consulting me on the change of use from shop to A5 hot food takeaway.

I can confirm with respect to noise and other environmental 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 and first floor) are provided with neighbouring residential premise, as per drawing No. 4 by Roberts Malloy Associates
2. Grease and carbon filters are installed together with noise attenuators to the internal ducting of the ventilation flue as per the details submitted in the Planning Statement by Roberts Malloy Associates dated June 2017.

I trust this is advice is of assistance.

David Harrold MCIEH

Senior Environmental Health Officer

Babergh and Mid Suffolk Council

## MEMBER REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

(Completed form to be sent to Case Officer and Corporate Manager)

See Planning Charter for principles. Paragraph references below link to Planning Charter.

Planning application reference	DC/17/04483
Parish	Rickinghall Inferior
Member making request	Cllr Derek Osborne and Cllr Jessica Fleming
13.3 Please describe the significant policy, consistency or material considerations which make a decision on the application of more than local significance	<p>Local Plan Policies</p> <p>E5 Change of Use within existing industrial/commercial areas. The proposal is for a change from shop/ newsagent/ Post Office to a take-away food outlet. The village already has several take-away facilities and now lacks these types of services, other facilities in the village already offer take-away food.</p> <p>S7 Provision of local shops The proposal does not satisfy the local need for local services and would occupy a key location for same.</p> <p>H16 Protecting existing residential amenity. The proposal could affect residential amenity (refer to H17)</p> <p>H17 Keeping residential development away from pollution – emissions for the extraction system could affect the amenity of nearby residents due to smell, oil dispersion and noise</p> <p>T9 Access, parking &amp; maneuvering – access and car parking is not available to support a new take-away at this location</p> <p>SDA7 Local Shopping facilities, the proposal does not meet the need for local shopping facilities</p> <p>HERITAGE and CONSERVATION AREA</p> <p>HB3 Listed Buildings – We understand that the building is Grade II Listed and not amenable to the type of alterations proposed for the extraction system, and could be vulnerable to oil emissions</p>
13.4 Please detail the clear and substantial planning reasons for requesting a referral	<p>With reference to the policies above, the proposal:</p> <p>Does not meet local service needs</p> <p>Is likely to affect local amenity negatively</p> <p>There is insufficient car parking or turning space for the proposed use, the adjacent pub spaces are limited to customers</p> <p>The proposal could negatively affect one or more Listed Buildings and Conservation Area</p>

<p>13.5 Please detail the wider District and public interest in the application</p>	<p>Service Provisions, Core Strategy 2012 para 1.52: 'Currently there is a poor provision of key basic services and facilities in the rural area and only 50.8% of villages have access to a food shop, general store, post office, public house, primary school and meeting place.'</p> <p>Rickinghall/ Botesdale has need for local services but NOT fast food take-away as these are already present. The location of the proposed facilities is not suited to a village setting, and could damage the character of a Conservation Area and Listed Building(s).</p>
<p>13.6 If the application is not in your Ward please describe the very significant impacts upon your Ward which might arise from the development</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>13.7 Please confirm what steps you have taken to discuss a referral to committee with the case officer</p>	<p>Telecom with planning officer Rebecca Biggs</p>



FAO: Planning Department,  
Babergh & Mid Suffolk District Councils

Ref: DC/17/04484  
Date: 20/12/2017

## HISTORIC BUILDINGS AND CONSERVATION ADVICE

Dear Sir / Madam,

### **The Newsagent, Bell Hill Cottage, The Street, Rickinghall Inferior, IP22 1BN**

The application is for insertion of internal extraction equipment with external flue, internal sound proofing and fire-proofing partitions and new internal door. Bell Hill cottage is a Grade II listed building (List Entry ID: 1064779).

The proposal includes the fireproofing/soundproofing of the front room of the building. It is understood an acoustic solution will obscure the original internal wall which includes exposed timbers. This will cause some harm to the aesthetic value of the building.

The soundproofing of the ceiling has potential to cause harm. Not enough information has been provided by the applicant pertaining to the date of the ceiling fabric or the manner in which the proposed suspended ceiling would be attached. As such I am unable to assess the level of harm to the fabric.

The principal of the application and change of use is acceptable. I would however recommend investigations are undertaken to ascertain the age/significance of the ceiling fabric and also find if less intrusive acoustic/soundproofing solutions are available.

Yours Sincerely,

Tim Murphy  
Historic Environment Manager  
Place Services

*Note: This letter is advisory and should only be considered as the opinion formed by specialist staff in relation to this particular matter.*

# Consultee Comments for Planning Application DC/17/04483

## Application Summary

Application Number: DC/17/04483

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

Proposal: Planning Application - Part change of use to form A5 hot food takeaway with extraction equipment and flue.

Case Officer: Rebecca Biggs

## Consultee Details

Name: Mrs Leeann Jackson-Eve

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

Email: rickingham\_pc@btopenworld.com

On Behalf Of: Rickingham Superior And Inferior Parish Clerk

## Comments

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 this site 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 also 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 an acceptable arrangement 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 and has requested that our District Councillor call in the application to be considered by the Planning Committee. We would urge the Committee to visit the site to get a true picture of its effect on the community.

**From:**Peter Bradfield

**Sent:**22 Sep 2017 13:19:30 +0100

**To:**BMSDC Planning Area Team Green;BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow;BMSDC Planning Area Team Blue

**Cc:**Kyle Porter

**Subject:**SCC Highway Authority planning application combined responses

To Babergh Mid Suffolk Planning,

This is the Highway Authority (SCC) combined recommendation to the planning applications listed in the table below. (Please note that individual responses will not be provided to these applications)

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

**The current proposal would not have any severe impact on the highway network in terms of vehicle volume or highway safety. Therefore, Suffolk County Council does not wish to restrict the grant of permission.**

DC/17/04038	Fairview, IP1 6TQ	Natalie Webb (green)
DC/17/04301	Zamora, CO10 2RN	Natalie Webb (green)
DC/17/04440	Dairy Farmhouse, IP21 5BZ	Fiona Fuller (yellow)
DC/17/04475	Rear of 1 Red House, IP6 8PN	Sarah Scott (blue)
DC/17/03785	Capitol Stud Farm, IP7 5PS	Andrew Thornton (blue)
DC/17/04473	Lady Lane Garage, IP7 6AF	Alex Scott (blue)
DC/17/04483	Newsagent, Bell Hill Cottage	Rebecca Biggs (yellow)
DC/17/04486	Langton Cottage, IP23 7HL	Katherine Hale (yellow)
DC/17/04484	Newsagent, Bell Hill Cottage	Rebecca Biggs (yellow)
DC/17/04560	Fernside, IP31 3BQ	Alex Peck (yellow)
DC/17/03642	Fernside, IP31 3BQ	Alex Scott (yellow)



DC/17/04482	Glebe Farm, IP8 3JD	Samantha Summers (green)
DC/17/04447	73 High St, IP14 6QS	Steven Burgess (blue)
DC/17/04539	Barret Lee BP Garage, CO10 2YH	Samantha Summers (green)
DC/17/03880	Shelly Rd, IP7 5QN	Melanie Corbishley (green)
DC/17/04507	Hargrave House, IP23 7JL	Natalie Webb (blue)
DC/17/03752	Spinney Cottage, CO10 0TB	Jonathan Pavey-Smith (green)
DC/17/03920	Church Farm, IP23 8AN	Sian Bunbury (yellow)
DC/17/04553	The Crossings, IP30 9NY	Alex Peck (yellow)

Regards,

Peter Bradfield

Development Management Technician

Suffolk County Council

Endeavour House | Russell Road | Ipswich | Suffolk | IP1 2BX

Tel: 07712 425574 and 01473 260410 | Email: [peter.bradfield@suffolk.gov.uk](mailto:peter.bradfield@suffolk.gov.uk) |

Web: [www.suffolk.gov.uk](http://www.suffolk.gov.uk)

Office email: [Highways.developmentcontrol@suffolk.gov.uk](mailto:Highways.developmentcontrol@suffolk.gov.uk)

**Subject:**FW: DC/17/04484- Newsagent, Bell Hill Cottage

**From:** Peter Bradfield

**Sent:** 14 November 2017 11:24

**To:** Rebecca Biggs

**Subject:** RE: DC/17/04484- Newsagent, Bell Hill Cottage

Dear Rebecca,

Further to your emails of 10 and 13 November.

I appreciate that this application has raised concerns with the local community. I have had a series of emails and telephone calls from a Mr Day criticising the Highway Authority response. I have reviewed application DC/17/04483 with the Senior Development Management Engineer for this area, Sam Harvey, and we remain of the view that this development will not have a severe cumulative impact on the highway and therefore maintain the Highway Authority No comment response.

We consider that it would not be appropriate at this location to introduce parking and/or loading restrictions such as double yellow lines. The footway at this location is not wide enough to install bollards without compromising the free flow of pedestrian movement. A narrowing of the available footway would be especially detrimental to wheelchair and mobility scooter users.

Our view is that overall vehicle movement numbers are likely to be broadly similar pre and post this development but the Planning Committee may wish to ask for a pre and post traffic survey to assess this. It is acknowledged that the pattern of use of this premise may extend later with the proposed use, when compared to its current use, but many newsagents do trade into the evening hours so the development is unlikely to have a severe cumulative impact on highway safety.

This area benefits from the provision of on-street parking which is not a resident only parking zone.

I hope this information will be of assistance.

Regards,

Peter Bradfield

Development Management Technician

Suffolk County Council

Endeavour House | Russell Road | Ipswich | Suffolk | IP1 2BX

Tel: 07712 425574 and 01473 260410 | Email: [peter.bradfield@suffolk.gov.uk](mailto:peter.bradfield@suffolk.gov.uk) |

Web: [www.suffolk.gov.uk](http://www.suffolk.gov.uk)