



BRANTHAM PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes

27 March 2019, 7.30pm at Brantham Village Hall

PRESENT: Mark Aherne (MA)
Clare Phillips (CP)
Paul Saward (PS) (Chair)

IN ATTENDANCE:
Sarah Keys (SK) (Clerk)
6 members of the public, 2 representatives from Taylor Wimpey
Cllrs A McCraw J Pearce, L Laws and L Dunnett

PLC 03.19.01	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE John Richardson (JS)
PLC 03.19.02	MINUTES The minutes of the meeting on 27 February 2019 were approved and signed as a true record of the meeting.
PLC 03.19.03	DECLARATION OF INTEREST None
PLC 03.19.04	<p>PLANNING APPLICATIONS DC/19/00881 Land South Of, Brooklands Road, Brantham, Suffolk Submission of details under Outline Planning Permission B/15/00263 (FUL) - Appearance, Landscaping, Layout, Scale for 288 dwellings, public open space and associated infrastructure The Planning Committee made the following comments:</p> <p><u>Section A -Summary of BPC understanding of this Application</u> The following is extracted from the Babergh District Council News Sheet "Brantham Regeneration Area Update". It is included so as to summarise BPCs understanding of the current overall situation, and the position of this present Application within the Process. All emphasis is added by BPC, in order to highlight Parish comments that follow.</p> <p><u>What does the Council mean by regeneration of this site?</u> The Babergh Core Strategy and Policies document was adopted by the Council on 25th February 2014. The main policy for Brantham is CS10. The primary aim of Policy CS10 is to seek the balanced regeneration and improvement of the main employment area - a site that has been predominately redundant for many years - in order to retain and maximise future employment opportunities aspiring to create 500 new full time jobs over the Core Strategy and Policies period 2011-2031 Policy CS10 also seeks to deliver the comprehensive redevelopment of the allocated site as a whole, through the delivery of an appropriate level of residential development and community facilities, and the creation of new public open spaces and enhancement to pedestrian and cycle links.</p>



Where are St Francis Group (SFG) now with preparation of their planning application?

Independent viability testing of the likely costs associated with the regeneration of the Brantham Regeneration Area is also nearing completion; the Council has appointed an independent viability expert from the Valuation Office Agency (VOA) to assess the viability of emerging proposals. This will help determine what resources are needed to pay for the regeneration ambitions and any mitigation (remedial) requirements for the core employment site. We are anticipating that SFG will submit a planning application later in the year.

Community Engagement –Next Steps

Following completion of the independent viability testing the Council will share its initial findings with Community Representatives (via the Place Shaping Group which was set up in March 2014) This will also be a valuable opportunity to agree the format for further engagement with the local community at this pre-application stage to help inform the masterplan for the Brantham Regeneration Area

BPC Comments on the overall SFG Application with regard to the original CS10 intentions.

It is understood that Outline Planning Permission has been granted and that this current application is to obtain approval of certain reserved matters. BPC's comments on those reserved matters are contained in the following section B.

BPC would however refer to the notes above and would remind those considering this application that the overall Application still does not address the Brantham Regeneration Area, except in the vaguest of terms. The Parish Council are aware that the Parish generally is of the opinion that the residential element, intended to facilitate the regeneration of the Brownfield (Employment) Area, is the only element being seriously considered. The Brownfield site remains unconsidered and, to the Parish, unlikely to be implemented within the foreseeable future. Direct requests to the Applicant regarding the viability and intentions relating to the Brownfield site are vague and much obfuscated.

BPC would appreciate sharing BDC s initial, and subsequent, findings on this matter so that it could inform the Parish, those who are most affected by this process.

Please now refer to Section B below regarding BPC comments on the Reserved Matters.

Section B – Comments on Reserved Matters

Suffolk Coasts and Heaths AONB

Natural England have published a Notice that it proposes to make an Order designating land as Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty in both the London Gazette and the East Anglian Daily Times, as required by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000.

Once confirmed by the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural affairs,



the Order will vary the boundary of the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB to include an additional area within Suffolk including the Stour Estuary. The public inspection of the draft variation Order closed on March 22nd 2019, and the extension can reasonably be expected to be implemented and to be in force by the construction of this Application.

While the Application site will not fall within the AONB, its eastern boundary, by the Decoy Pond, will then be immediately adjacent to the AONB.

It will then be reasonable to expect that the proximity of the AONB will require a high standard of design and elevational treatment, these being visible, and influencing, and views from within the AONB.

- The various elevational treatments proposed will be commented upon in detail later, but BPC would comment that –
- All elevations visible from within the AONB shall be treated as “Front Elevations” i.e. they will finished as the front elevations used to define the Rolling Field, or other House Character, Type.
- The various elevational treatments proposed will address the Palette of colours as suggested by the AONB Publication “Guidance on the selection and use of colour in development: Guidance”. The Dedham Vale AONB have already adopted such guidance and similar compliance will need to be ensured.

Access for the Disabled

It is understood that the existing site conditions are steep in some parts, and that legislation does not ensure suitable inclines etc. within outdoor areas, except where these address access to door thresholds etc.

BPC estimate that the western boundary falls on average at 1:18, and the eastern boundary at an average of 1:11, in places much more.

The winding nature of the road/pavements at the western end are no doubt designed to limit this incline, but this is not apparent, from the proposed layout, at the eastern end along the footpath running down to the Decoy Pond. The average incline at approx. 1:11 is already unacceptable for such users, and the path design would benefit from the occasional “dog leg” to reduce the steepness, and including for occasional level areas as rest areas.

BPC would request that BDC apply their own policies with regard to ensuring equality for the disabled in resolving this issue, wherever it may occur within this site.

It is understood that SCC as Highways Authority have a holding refusal based upon the submitted road design and it is to be expected that disabled access will be addressed within any amended road and footpath layout.



Sustainability relating to environmental considerations.

The Application refers throughout as to being a sustainable development. This appears to be as the definition contained within the NPPF. The Application however only refers in passing to its environmental credentials, and additional information needs to be provided in assessing the Application. Egg -

- Use of natural insulations
- Use of Triple glazing, and not only where sound insulation is required
- Use of communal heating systems
- Heat Recovery
- Solar Panels, PV arrays etc. as installed elements and controls.
- Installation of all infrastructure necessary for the supply of future electric car charging facilities, to both private and communal parking areas. (To avoid later disruption of common and private areas)
- Use of locally available natural materials. (E.g. clay tiles and NOT concrete copies, no use of slates which is not a local tradition.
- Compliance with Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) and Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification (PEFC), assure that all wood and wood-based products originate from sustainable sources.

Sustainability relating to car use , parking and road design

The Developer is required to formulate and supply to all Purchasers a Transport Plan in order to establish sustainable usage of vehicles.

BPC note that there is a considerable use of tandem parking where spaces are allocated within the curtilage of a house, and even, in some instances, within parking courts. Tandem parking is a parking arrangement where two cars are parked in-line and may need to be started and manoeuvred in order to arrive, park and depart. BPC question whether this is a sustainable arrangement, and would look for it to be altered to a side by side arrangement.

Housing Need

The use of tandem parking and remote communal areas of parking elsewhere in private drives and parking courts would suggest that the overall housing density is far too high.

It is understood that Strategic Housing within BDC have recommended a holding objection on the basis of the housing mix not being wholly suitable, or of meeting the wider needs of the Babergh community. This includes a recommendation that there are less of the larger (4+) houses and being required to concentrate more on housing for first time buyers, families and those wishing to downsize.

This strategy would indirectly support BPCs desire to see house specific allocation of car parking, avoiding communal parking areas, and sited within each buildings curtilage so as to support the needs of older people, and vulnerable or identified groups of people as reflected in local needs assessments. The use of remote car parking certainly does not address the needs of the elderly, disabled or the vulnerable.



Car Parking and Road Design

It is understood that SCC as Highways Authority have a holding refusal based upon the submitted road design, and BPC would ask for the following to also be considered in any amended design.

BPC note the following apparent problems which have been identified-

- There are many houses which have no immediately connected parking spaces, these having to rely on communal parking areas. Each House should ideally be allocated at least one parking space. Where the current design fails to allow this, remote spaces must be allocated and identified within the freehold of each specific house so that Homeowners have ownership of an allocated space.
- There are many roads and drives which are private, i.e. not adoptable and which will be controlled by a private Management Company. Presumably home purchasers will be required to agree to such a contractual arrangement, and to ensure that this obligation is passed onwards upon a future resale? Such arrangements are not inherently sustainable in themselves, and gradual deterioration of the infrastructure is a likely outcome.
- BPC would request that all non-adoptable roads and infrastructure will be constructed to adoptable SCC standards, so as to minimise any gradual deterioration.
- The Application notes that Manningtree Station is only 1.5km distant. The Applicant should be required to ensure that casual on street parking is prevented on an ongoing and maintained basis, this being limited to short duration parking by delivery etc. vehicles.. Similarly, the design should disallow any casual parking on grassed and similar areas.
- Many of the private drives do not provide sufficient turning space for delivery and emergency vehicles to access and egress, all such drives must conform to SCC roadway requirements.
- Many of the private courts intended for parking have tandem arrangements which will require manoeuvring within the highway in order for car movement to take place. Hopefully all of these situations will be identified and resolved by SCC Highways.

Summary

The above sets out the obvious problems and unacceptable solutions inherent in this proposal. Some of the arrangements for emergency service delivery, commercial delivery and car parking are clearly inadequate for purpose. Many of the private drives and parking courts have no adequate turning heads.

These and other matters noted above all arise directly from the high density which the Applicant is attempting to achieve.

This belief appears to be supported by the holding objections current at the time of writing this report.(See summary below, with special regard to the Strategic Housing response))



It is the opinion of the Brantham Parish Council that the proposed density needs to be reduced, and sufficiently, in order to achieve a workable layout that demonstrates the sustainable elements required by the NPPF.

Statutory Responses on website.

- Environment Agency – raising a holding objection on flood risk grounds
- Suffolk Highways – have advised that there are a number of highways related issues for which further information and changes to the design to make the proposals acceptable. At the moment they are recommending holding refusal on this application.
- NHS – advise that the Manningtree Surgery is not able to absorb the increased requirements arising. They will not however object providing a suitable CIL contribution is made available to limit the impact
- BDC Policy Strategy – Recommends that the case officer is strongly recommended to ensure that full assessments of the proposals , harms, and benefits from a social, economic and environmental perspective are fully exhausted. Also to ensure all planning matters have been considered and appropriately weighted to ensure a sound recommendation is concluded.
- BDC Strategic Housing - advise as follows-

This scheme includes 2, 3, 4 and 5 bed market homes. It is recommended that there are less 4 and 5 beds and consideration be given to the inclusion of more 2 bedroomed homes particularly suitable for older people. It is extremely disappointing that there are no single-storey or 1.5 storey dwellings included in this proposal other than the associated garages. This broader mix will be suitable for first time buyers, families and older people wishing to downsize.

In view of the housing mix proposed for this site, Strategic Housing recommend a Holding Objection on the basis of the housing mix not meeting the wider needs of the Babergh Community who wish to and are able to have their housing needs met through the open market as set out in Core Strategy Policy CS18.

Policy CS18: Mix and Types of Dwellings

Residential development that provides for the needs of the District's population, particularly the needs of older people will be supported where such local needs exist, and at a scale appropriate to the size of the development. The mix, type and size of the housing development will be expected to reflect established needs in the Babergh district (see also Policy CS15). Development on strategic housing sites or mixed-use developments with a substantial residential element will be required to make provision for the accommodation needs of vulnerable or identified groups of people, as reflected in established local needs assessments.

Section C - Comments on House Type and Character Proposals

General

The Application proposes the following Character Types:
Victorian/Edwardian



Rolling Valley Farmland
Industrial Edge

BPC considers that the proposed House Character types are a reasonably considered response, responding as they do to the more recognisably traditional buildings within Brantham.

BPC recognise however that the use of such standard types, especially in large numbers, can fail where:

- The end result is a clear pastiche, and not a subtle reference.
- The detailed treatment is incorrect, or incorrectly applied.
- Both of the above

Generally BPC would wish to see more subtle detailing of traditional features, with less use of contrasting colours in the use of quoin and arch detailing. BPC would also wish for a blending of house character areas and types so that a blurring of boundaries between the three areas is achieved.

The use of slates should be avoided since these are not indigenous to East Anglia, being a Victorian import when Welsh natural slate was the cheapest form of roof covering. Clay materials should be used wherever possible, being a local and sustainable material. Where slate is allowed, this should be Welsh slate, properly detailed, and not a composite material.

Design specific notes

These notes are included in order to record specifically where the proposed period details and elevation treatments are considered not entirely correct. It is felt that such details must be correct, especially within areas visible from the AONB.

Victorian/Edwardian

House Type NA41 and NA45 and variations

The main roof covering shall be the same material as that to the bay window. The size of the bay window would suggest the use of small units such as plain tiles.

The use of brick quoins and arched brick lintels is acceptable. It is not acceptable however to use stretcher bond to openings on the rear elevations, which must be at least a soldier course throughout.

House Type NB51, NT41, PT36 and PT37 and variations

The use of render is acceptable at first floor, but must not be allowed to be taken partially onto the side elevations. This is not a traditional detail on Edwardian/Victorian Houses, and certainly not in Brantham. The side render is unnecessary and visually detractive. The proposed dormers are visually too heavy in appearance. It is not acceptable to use stretcher bond to openings on the rear and side elevations, which must in all situations be at least a soldier course.

House Type NA51 and Variations



	<p>The use of brick quoins and arched brick lintels is acceptable. It is not acceptable however to use stretcher bond to openings on the rear elevations, which must in all situations throughout be at least a soldier course.</p> <p><u>House Type PA34 and PT44 and Variations</u> The use of render is acceptable at first floor, but must not be allowed to be taken partially onto the side elevations, as note above. It is not acceptable to use stretcher bond to openings on the rear and side elevations, which must in all situations be at least a soldier course</p> <p><u>House Type NB31, PA25 and Variations</u> The combination of brick quoins and arched lintel to the door should be avoided, as the junction between door quoins and lintel is not properly detailed or resolved. Similarly to the four windows to the side elevation. The proposed dormers are visually too heavy in appearance. It is not acceptable to use stretcher bond to openings on the rear and side elevations, which must in all situations be at least a soldier course. On all variations, the use of render is acceptable at first floor, but must not be allowed to be taken partially onto the side elevations, as note above.</p> <p><u>Rolling Valley Farmland</u> All House Types</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All elevations visible from within the AONB shall be treated as “Front Elevations” i.e. they will finish as the front elevations used to define the Rolling Field Type. • The various elevation treatments proposed will address the Palette of colours as suggested by the AONB Publication “Guidance on the selection and use of colour in development: Guidance”. The Dedham Vale AONB have already adopted such guidance and similar compliance will need to be ensured <p><u>Industrial Edge</u> House Type PT36 and NT41 Where applicable, it is not acceptable to use stretcher bond to openings on the rear and side elevations, which must in all situations be at least a soldier course The rear elevations are generally plain brick which require to relieve by some form of detail (egg the use of blind windows) or other articulation. A blank wall is visually unacceptable, no matter what the reason.</p> <p>DC/19/01352 The Hawthorns, Brantham Hill, Brantham, Manningtree Suffolk CO11 1SH Garage conversion The Planning Committee made no comment</p>
<p>PLC 03.19.05</p>	<p>PLANNING RESULTS DC/19/00212 51 New Village, Brantham, Manningtree, Suffolk CO11 1RZ Erection of a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension</p>



	<p>PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED</p> <p>Cllr McCraw informed the Committee that he had just received notification that the planning application at 11/12 Ipswich Road had been GRANTED.</p>
PLC 03.19.06	<p>CORRESPONDENCE AND LATE PLANNING APPLICATIONS</p> <p>The Clerk highlighted the letter received from Rainier Developments highlighting a proposal to develop the Land South of Slough Road. The Committee agreed to make a formal response when a full planning application is received.</p>
PLC 03.19.07	<p>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</p> <p>Wednesday 24 April 2019, 7.30pm at Brantham Village Hall</p>

MEETING FINISHED AT 8.02pm

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