



BRANTHAM PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes

22 July 2020, 7.30pm at Ramblers Cottage, Ipswich Road and via ZOOM

PRESENT: Mark Aherne (MA)
Mal Bridgeman (MB)
Clare Phillips (CP)
Paul Seward (PS) (Chair)

IN ATTENDANCE:
Sarah Keys (SK) (Clerk), 4 members of the public

PLC 07.20.01	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE None
PLC 07.20.02	MINUTES The minutes of the meeting on 27 May 2020 were approved and signed as a true record of the meeting.
PLC 07.20.03	DECLARATION OF INTEREST None
PLC 07.20.04	PLANNING APPLICATIONS DC/20/02433 The Bungalow, Brantham Hill, Brantham, Manningtree Suffolk CO11 1ST Alterations to existing conservatory to convert into an extension, including raising the flat roof and installing new windows and doors. THE PC MADE NO COMMENT DC/20/02711 15 Welhams Way, Brantham, Manningtree, Suffolk CO11 1RU Erection of single storey side and front extensions. THE PC MADE NO COMMENT DC/20/02773 16 Temple Pattle, Brantham, Manningtree, Suffolk CO11 1RW Erection of a single storey rear extension and conversion of attached garage to living space THE PC MADE NO COMMENT DC/20/02459 Land South Of Ipswich Road, Brantham, Suffolk, 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 SEE COMMENTS AT APPENDIX A DC/20/02968



	27 New Village, Brantham, Manningtree, Suffolk CO11 1RL Erection of a first floor side extension (amended scheme to DC/20/00108) THE PC MADE NO COMMENTS
PLC 07.20.05	PLANNING RESULTS None
PLC 07.20.06	CORRESPONDENCE AND LATE PLANNING APPLICATIONS Non-Material Amendment to DC/19/00881 Land South Of, Brooklands Road, Brantham, Suffolk Removal of Electric-Substation, Replan of House types for Plots 242 and 243, Amendments to garage sizes (Plots 34, 35, 62/63, 64/65, 68/69, 70, 92, 104, 105, 248/249), Amendments to Approved Boundary Treatments and Landscaping, Adjustments to plot positioning for Plots 262-265 NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 26 New Village, Brantham, Manningtree, Suffolk CO11 1RL Application for Non Material Amendment to DC/19/01883 - Change approved rear hipped roof to flat roof with lantern & two roof lights.
PLC 0.20.07	DATE OF NEXT MEETING Wednesday 26 August 2020, 7.30pm, Brantham Village Hall or via ZOOM

MEETING FINISHED AT 8.10pm

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



APPENDIX A

Brantham Parish Council

DC/20/02459 - Land South Of Ipswich Road Brantham Suffolk

Full Planning Application - 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

Materially Relevant Matters

1. The Site is outside of the existing built up area boundary.
2. The July 2019 BMSDC Shelaar 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 contain 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 Shelaar 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 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.