



BRANTHAM PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes

27 January 2021, 7.30pm via ZOOM

PRESENT: Mal Bridgeman (MB) (Chair)
Jackie Heywood (substitute)
Eric Osben (EO)

IN ATTENDANCE: Sarah Keys (SK) (Clerk), 2 members of the public

PLC 01.21.01	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE Cllrs Mark Aherne and Paul Saward
PLC 01.21.02	MINUTES Cllr Bridgeman proposed that the minutes of the meeting on 27 November 2020 were approved and the members of the committee who had been present agreed that these will be signed at the next available opportunity.
PLC 01.21.03	DECLARATION OF INTEREST None
PLC 01.21.04	PLANNING APPLICATIONS DC/20/05807 1 Brooklands Road, Brantham, Manningtree, Suffolk CO11 1RN Erection of side and rear flat roof extension (following demolition of existing side/rear extension) THE COMMITTEE AGREED THE FOLLOWING RESPONSE FROM THE PARISH COUNCIL; It would be far better for the visual continuity of the existing streetscape if #1 were left as brickwork, the extension matching the extant brickwork. Windows to the new extension bedroom and bathroom should not be located directly on the site boundary, and that it would be sensible for BDC Planning to obtain the advice of BDC Building Regs. prior to granting permission. DC/21/00370 2 New Village, Brantham, Manningtree, CO11 1SB Erection of two storey side extension and single storey rear extension and alterations. BPC MADE NO COMMENT DC/20/02459 Land South Of Ipswich Road, Brantham Construction of 127 Dwellings (Comprising 83no. market and 44no. affordable homes) Garages, Parking, Vehicular Access onto Ipswich Road, Estate Roads, Church/Nursery Car Park (Comprising 30no. parking bays), Public Open Space, Play Areas, Landscaping, Drainage and other associated Infrastructure COMMENTS FROM PLANNING COMMITTEE ATTACHED AT APPENDIX A
PLC 01.21.05	PLANNING RESULTS DC/20/05184



	<p>18 Valley Close, Brantham, Manningtree, CO11 1QG Erection of front porch PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED</p> <p>DC/20/05329 Hillcroft, Stutton Road, Brantham, Manningtree Suffolk CO11 1PP Erection of two storey side and rear extension, single storey rear extension and front porch (following demolition of existing front porch.) PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED</p>
PLC 01.21.06	<p>CORRESPONDENCE AND LATE PLANNING APPLICATIONS Discharge of Conditions Application for DC/18/05610 - Condition 10 (Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy) 11 Ipswich Road, Brantham, Manningtree Suffolk CO11 1PB DETAILS RECEIVED CONSIDERED ACCEPTABLE</p> <p>Application for prior notification for a proposed excavation/construction of Winter Storage Reservoir for the purposes of Agriculture. Stage 2 of DC/20/00191 Agricultural Determination under Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, Schedule 2, Part 6. Brantham Hall Farm, The Chase, Brantham, Manningtree Suffolk CO11 1PT PRIOR APPROVAL GIVEN SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS</p> <p>Discharge of Conditions Application for DC/18/05177 - Condition 12 (Bat Licence) Brantham Place, Church Lane, Brantham, Manningtree Suffolk CO11 1QA DETAILS CONSIDERED ACCEPTABLE</p> <p>Appeal Ref: APP/D3505/W/19/3241261 Land South of Slough Road, Brantham, Suffolk THE APPEAL IS ALLOWED AND PERMISSION IS GRANTED FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 65 NEW DWELLINGS (INCLUDING A MINIMUM OF 35% AFFORDABLE HOMES), WITH AREAS OF LANDSCAPING AND PUBLIC OPEN SPACE, INCLUDING VEHICULAR ACCESS AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE WORKS AT LAND SOUTH OF SLOUGH ROAD, BRANTHAM, SUFFOLK, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE TERMS OF THE APPLICATION, REF DC/19/01973</p>
PLC 01.21.07	<p>DATE OF NEXT MEETING Wednesday 24 February 2021, 7.30pm, Brantham Village Hall or via ZOOM</p>

MEETING FINISHED AT 7.47pm

SIGNED.....DATED.....



APPENDIX A

We note the applicant has verbally committed to a number changes, based on some feedback from the first application. There will be no street lighting, which is welcomed, and they will agree a palette of materials and colours with the AONB, even though they still show they will be using either concrete tiles or fibre cement slates in the application. We mentioned this in our earlier comments reproduced in full below but we would stress this is a basic requirement of any development adjacent to two AONBs and a historic setting.

In addition to our original comments we would echo the consultation comments of the Suffolk Preservation Society submitted on 04/08/2021 and the Dedham Vale AONB response on 20/01/2021 who both eloquently describe why a development such as is proposed, is not suitable for this location.

Finally we would like to address the claimed sustainability of this proposed development. We appreciate that sustainable developments should be seen favourably but it should also be very demonstrably clear in what way that sustainability will be delivered, economically, socially and environmentally, rather than just claimed. As an example, at the recent meeting with the Parish Council the applicant explained they had no plans to implement charging points for electric cars. We note other developers in the village have agreed to install the necessary infrastructure to all car spaces for future ar charging. The ducts and wiring etc. should be integral with the construction.

Brantham Parish Council response dated 30/07/2020 (We would reiterate that the comments we made in our initial response still apply in full) :

Materially Relevant Matters

1. The Site is outside of the existing built up area boundary.
2. The July 2019 BMSDC Shelaa plan (integral with the Joint Local Plan) clearly shows this site as being suitable for partial development only, and limiting this to a maximum of 30 units, arranged as an infill development along the Ipswich Road.
3. The site adjoins the new AONB extension.

Brantham Parish Council Comments

With regard to Items 1 and 2 above:

Brantham was, until recently a village comprising circa 900 dwellings. The expansion by both approved and currently under-construction dwellings will take this to nearly 1300, approximately 40% expansion with no proportionate increase in infrastructure, indeed with an overall decrease , given the unacceptable closure of the village post office.

It is understood that Brantham, as a hinterland village within the East Bergholt cluster, currently supports an excess of the required supply of both the five year, and affordable housing, requirements established for the Babergh District.

There has additionally been significant housing development within nearby Lawford, with one estate almost complete; another in construction and another possibly on stream shortly.

In addition, a recent Supreme Court ruling has refused the East Bergholt Parish Council's request to appeal the Court of Appeal's refusal of the East Bergholt Judicial Review. This contested the decision to approve three planning applications at Moore's Lane, Heath Road and Hadleigh Road. These are now all free for construction, increasing pressure on local services and roads. The East Bergholt Judicial Review submission surely contains sufficient evidence that the East



Bergholt cluster has reached a sufficient, if not an excess of, housing supply.

Summary

BPC finds therefore that this proposed development is wholly disproportionate to the existing hinterland village.

BPC recommends that this application be refused, but recognises the 2019 Shelaa recommendations that any development of this site must be partial, and limited to a linear development of a maximum of 30 units, as identified within the JLP currently under consideration.

General Comments 1

AONB extension,

With regard to Item 3 above:

While the Application site does not fall within the AONB, it is now immediately adjacent to the AONB extension.

It is reasonable therefore to expect that the proximity of the AONB extension will require a higher than usual standard of design and elevational treatment, these being visible from within the AONB.

BPC require, should this proposal be consented, that -

- All housing elevations visible from within the AONB shall be treated and finished as the approved "Front Elevations".

- The various elevational treatments so far proposed will need to address the Palette of Colours as suggested by the AONB Publication "Guidance on the selection and use of colour in Development: Guidance". The neighbouring Dedham Vale AONB continue to insist on the adoption of such guidance within new developments, and a similar and no lesser compliance will be acceptable in this application.

- It is noted that the developer states that the development will be using only "locally sourced" materials. BPC require that this is strictly observed by Conditions, and that only local indigenous materials, with appropriate traditional building detailing, will be approved. The use of (for example) slate or slate type materials is not acceptable as it is not geologically indigenous to the region, and cannot thereby be considered as "locally sourced". Similarly the use of concrete look-alike roofing materials must be avoided, the proximity to the AONB requiring plain clay tiles or preferably Suffolk pantiles as a minimum standard.

General Comments 2

BPC include the following comments which have been identified by or to to the Parish Council, and would request that these, where appropriate, be considered for resolution by the detailed design, either as reserved matters or as Conditions.

Traffic and Road Safety

The cumulative affect of this and other local developments , noted above, have already impacted on local traffic conditions and consequently road safety.

The developer in their (self) commissioned transport survey acknowledge that many junctions are already over capacity before any of these homes are added into the mix. There appears to be no provision for the growth in traffic due to the expansions of the neighbouring Lawford, nor the three newly approved East Bergholt Developments.

The traffic report acknowledges that significant proportions of traffic exceed the speed limit with speeds recorded in excess of 80mph. It is to be noted that the A137 is a Lorry Transport Route, The author of the transport report appears unaware of the difficulty of Ipswich Road residents in getting out of own their drives during rush hours . Advice from residents suggests waiting times up



to two minutes. This delay will inevitably be experienced by future residents who when faced with such delays will surely resort to frustration and increasingly risky traffic movements as will the additional traffic lead to more risky manoeuvres elsewhere.

The proposed crossing will only exacerbate such concerns as vehicles will inevitably queue in front of the houses on Ipswich Road, then seek to "recover their lost time" when the crossing is free.

Whilst much is made of sustainable transport options, the author of the report has clearly never cycled the routes proposed - Travelling Southwards is risky with vehicles overtaking on blind corners with no regard to oncoming traffic (there are double white lines) and travelling northwards requires the cyclist to negotiate Brantham Hill which is a not a route other than for the keenest of cyclists. Brantham Hill was, within recent memory, a Mountain Section in the Tour of Britain.

Despite claims that the report has considered the 'Identification of Hazards and the Assessment of Risk of Walked Routes to School' (2002) document, the author is clearly unaware that the route he proposes for children to walk to East Bergholt High School is already regarded as unsafe which is why local pupils from the village have to use a special bus to travel to East Bergholt High School.

The Report, in its junction assessment, ignores the Slough Road / A137 interchange. This is a significant oversight, especially in view of the East Bergholt Appeal Court ruling. Although some heed is taken of the Lawford based developments there appears to be no assessment of the now approved and free to proceed East Bergholt developments.

Access to the site as proposed is clearly a safety risk - the sight lines look directly into the sun during morning and evening rush hours and the view to the east is especially short, given that the A137 is an LTR with HGVs and cars regularly observed to ignore the speed limits. The last time a meaningful safety improvement was made on this road was sometime ago and the circumstances which led to that are well known locally and not to be repeated.

Heritage

The field in question is adjacent to the newly created AONB and has two heritage assets directly adjacent. The Brantham Church and Lych gate are heritage assets but both are inextricably linked to the open field which allows unfettered views from all angles - current all round views of and from the Church will be obscured by such a development. The setting for the asset is as important as the asset itself.

The construction of an estate of the nature proposed, will obliterate the view of the Church for most people and passing traffic and hence destroy the key part of such an asset - namely that it can be appreciated by all the local residents.

If the developer wishes to enhance the views of the church, then limiting that view with this development, and then creating sight lines through the obstruction so created is not an acceptable way forward. BPC cannot agree that this is achieved by the submitted proposal.

Archeology

BPC will wish that any unexpected archeological finds and subsequent investigations are fully covered by Conditions.

Light Pollution

The Stour Valley AONB is well known as a dark sky area and it is to be expected that any estate designed lighting will accommodate such criteria, especially with regard to the adjacent and extended AONB.



The Northern end of Brantham has no street lighting and already enjoys very little in the way of light pollution - the developer at their "meet the public" session had no answer as to whether they would plan street lights. Given the proximity to the homes of bats, muntjacs, skylarks etc such a change would be very disruptive both to wildlife and to neighbouring houses.

Car park

A gravel car park of the type described would very quickly fall into disrepair - there is no statement within the proposal as to how, and by whom, such a car park would be maintained. Its construction on what is essentially a blind corner, proximal to a nursery, is also a significant safety risk.

Brantham Parish Council has no statutory duty with regard to the provision or maintenance of car parks, and the developer should clarify this matter within the proposal.