



BRANTHAM PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes

22 September 2021, 7.30pm at Brantham Village Hall

PRESENT: Mark Aherne (MA)
Mal Bridgeman (MB) (Chair)
Eric Osben (EO)

IN ATTENDANCE: Sarah Keys (SK) (Clerk), 2 members of the public and District Councillor A McCraw

PLC 09.21.01	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE The Committee noted the formal resignation received from Cllr Seward and confirmed the appointment of Cllr Cherry to the Committee. Cllr Bridgeman proposed the Committee approves the apologies received from Cllr Cherry. This was seconded by Cllr Osben and aif.</p>
PLC 09.21.02	<p>MINUTES Cllr Bridgeman proposed that the minutes of the last meeting on 25 August 2021 were approved as an accurate record of the meeting. This was seconded by Cllr Osben. Cllr Aherne abstained from the vote. The motion was carried.</p>
PLC 09.21.03	<p>DECLARATION OF INTEREST None</p>
PLC 09.21.04	<p>PLANNING APPLICATIONS</p> <p>DC/21/04890 44 New Village, Brantham, Suffolk, CO11 1RZ Erection of two storey side and single rear extension to include integral garage (following removal of existing garage) BPC MADE NO COMMENT</p> <p>DC/21/04359 Land South Of, Slough Road, Brantham, Suffolk Reserved Matters Application following Outline Application DC/19/01973 and subsequent appeal APP/D3505/W/19/3241261. Town and Country Planning Act 1990 - Erection of 65No residential dwellings (of which 35% allocated as affordable homes) including landscaping, public open space and associated infrastructure. PLEASE SEE COMMENTS FROM BPC AT APPENDIX A</p> <p>DC/21/04791 6 The Poplars, Brantham, Suffolk, CO11 1PR Erection of single-storey pitched roof outbuilding garage/store to front of dwelling. BPC MADE THE FOLLOWING COMMENT – The location of the outbuilding appears inconsistent with the current streetscape. The Parish Council suggests that if successful this should be moved closer to the house.</p> <p>DC/21/05032 40 New Village, Brantham, Suffolk, CO11 1RL Erection of two storey side extension. BPC MADE THE FOLLOWING COMMENT – The provision for parking in this area is currently insufficient and the Parish Council suggests that if this application is approved any</p>



BRANTHAM
Parish Council

	proposal should comply with Suffolk Highway rules.
PLC 09.21.05	PLANNING RESULTS DC/21/03575 Iona, Ipswich Road, Brantham, Suffolk CO11 1PB Erection of single storey rear and side extensions, porch extension and new carport. Raising pitch of roof pitch and insertion of windows and balcony to facilitate loft conversion. PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED
PLC 09.21.06	CORRESPONDENCE AND LATE PLANNING APPLICATIONS The Committee noted the minutes received from EB Parish Council including comments re: Land South of Slough Road
PLC 09.21.07	DATE OF NEXT MEETING Wednesday 27 October 2021, 7.30pm, Brantham Village Hall

MEETING FINISHED AT 8.01pm

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



APPENDIX A

The Brantham Parish Council would like to ensure there are distinct conditions regarding the sustainability of the development especially regarding reusable materials, reduced waste and tending toward a zero carbon footprint. Part of this would be the inclusion of electric car charging facilities for each dwelling which are required by the appeal decision as indeed is secure cycle storage which is not visible in the plans.

Good to see affordable housing at 35% of dwellings but note they are the smaller buildings, in close proximity of each other and appear to be built of different materials to the houses not categorised as affordable.

Brantham still relies on East Bergholt and Manningtree High schools to educate the 11+ age group - travel needs of these age groups needs to be considered and catered for in terms of grants to cover the costs for these children.

Footpath/rights of way do not seem to have been clearly retained. School children attending East Bergholt High School by bus are being expected to cross Slough Road twice each journey to get to the bus stop and people taking children to Gravel Pit Lane play area, or to catch the bus into Ipswich will be required to cross Slough Road 3 times whilst children attending Manningtree High School will need to cross Slough Road twice and the A137 to get to school. There is a need to improve the footpaths around the fields in order to keep the school children safe. The Council would ask that a condition is created which would improve the foot network to avoid this situation

The drawings show quite a verdant western border to the development and as per the appeal, the nature of this border should be secured via a planning condition.

The appeal also proposed some 1.5 height dwellings to soften the border yet, apart from the required single-story dwelling at the north end, all other dwellings are double height with no building being 1.5 height - this needs to be rectified to adhere to the appeal ruling. A key phrase in the “appearance” of the proposal when viewed from East End “towards the gap on Slough Road would show the two settlements closer than before, but the undeveloped and landscaped frontage would provide some mitigation. “

Further, all housing elevations visible from within the AONB shall be treated and finished as the approved “Front Elevations”

The various elevational treatments 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.

Further to the earlier point about sustainability, it is noted that the developer states that the development will be sustainable and should therefore 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 pan-tiles as a minimum standard.

East Bergholt PC have commented on the provision of planted screening along the western boundary, and of limiting development in order to achieve sufficient density to provide visual screening. This should be subject of a Condition with the type of planting, height and density to be agreed.

This end of the village has very limited light pollution and as such the development should be sympathetic to that.

Notwithstanding these comments, all other conditions identified in the appeal decision should apply as a minimum.