

**BABERGH DISTRICT COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

14 JANUARY 2009

ADDENDUM TO PAPER H161

**SUMMARY OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED SINCE THE
PUBLICATION OF THE AGENDA BUT BEFORE 12 NOON ON THE WORKING DAY
BEFORE THE MEETING AND ERRATA**

Item No	Page	Summary
1	5-16	<p data-bbox="475 633 794 667"><u>Local Highway Authority</u></p> <p data-bbox="475 667 1273 701">No objection subject to the imposition of conditions requiring:</p> <ul data-bbox="475 701 1273 840" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="475 701 1214 734">• parking, loading and manoeuvring areas to provided,<li data-bbox="475 734 1190 768">• the provision of ten additional parking spaces, and,<li data-bbox="475 768 1273 840">• the improvement of the Stonehouse Road/George Street junction. <p data-bbox="475 875 1374 1176">In addition the Local Highway Authority has commented that parking standards are based on the amount of useable public floor area. The requirement for Swimming Pools/Gymnasia/Sports Halls is 1 space per 10 sq.m.and 1 space per 4 sq.m for Community Halls. The proposal therefore requires approx. 78 spaces. These standards are MAXIMUM standards, and bearing in mind the location of the facility, together with the good links to public transport, cycling/pedestrian networks it is not reasonable to insist/expect the full provision that could be calculated.</p> <p data-bbox="475 1211 639 1245"><u>Kevin Neary</u></p> <ul data-bbox="475 1245 1366 1686" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="475 1245 1145 1279">• Concerned over the handling of the application.<li data-bbox="475 1279 1318 1350">• Considers the details submitted are incomplete, the decision should not be made until all details are submitted.<li data-bbox="475 1350 1366 1451">• The site is described as parkland in the application however the site is in fact East House Meadow Play Area. The loss of this play area is glossed over<li data-bbox="475 1451 1366 1585">• The provisional parking is only for 17 spaces as shown on the plans; Suffolk County Councils parking requirements for the development require 112 spaces. To achieve this, a further acre of the play area would be lost.<li data-bbox="475 1585 1366 1686">• Although the site is in a Conservation Area, Babergh's in house Conservation and Listed Buildings Specialist has not been consulted. <p data-bbox="475 1722 1321 1794"><u>Emily Slade and Andrew Kennington (on behalf of Suffolk Acting Youth)</u></p> <ul data-bbox="475 1794 1350 1928" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="475 1794 1350 1928">• Support the application and point out that there are several groups of young people who would benefit from a place to hold their meetings, gather socially and put on activities for all age groups.

Item No	Page	Summary
		<p><u>Richard Ward</u> In summary makes the following representations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The intended position of the building would erode space that currently acts as a buffer between historic buildings and the swimming pool. As such the proposed development is likely to appear cramped. • The George Street/Stone Street/Threadneedle Street junction has a poor safety record and the additional traffic generated by the proposal will exacerbate existing problems. The Local Highway Authority has not addressed this point. • The impact of the development upon the setting of adjacent listed buildings has not been adequately considered. • Given the open nature of the site, the proposed development form, its scale and design, the proposal will not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of this part of the conservation area.
2	17-29	<p><u>Applicant</u> Has submitted an Addendum to the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) produced in support of the application.</p> <p><u>Environment Agency</u> Object - have considered the additional information contained within the Addendum to the FRA but require further information in order to be satisfied that the proposal will not lead to flooding problems. Furthermore in view of the availability of other housing sites within the Sudbury area that are more suitable for development the proposal fails the Sequential Test given in PPS25, Annex D.</p> <p><u>Head of Community Development (Strategic Housing Manager)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is located within the built up area of Sudbury which has the area of highest affordable housing need in the district. • Following an assessment of the need in Sudbury, it is confirmed that 35% affordable housing delivery is required for the site. • The mix proposed for this site is intended to deliver a range of affordable housing that will create a sustainable community. • Affordable dwellings should be provided in groups of no more than 15 units. All the affordable housing must be delivered to Homes and Communities agency Scheme design Standards and to Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3. • The mix required is 35% (17 units) affordable units (based on a development of 48 units). • The mix would be 9 smaller dwellings (houses and flats), 6 x 3 bed houses and 2 x 4 bedroom houses. • The Council prefers the affordable housing delivered on site to be transferred to the ownership of one or more of its partner housing associations. • The Council does not support bids for Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) Social Housing Grant unless some added value is provided.

Item No	Page	Summary
		<p>During the current economic climate, proven site viability issues that threaten to reduce the ability of a developer to bring forward the 35% affordable housing, may be considered for grant in order to deliver the full 35% requirement. A request for grant in such circumstances will be subject to a full assessment by an expert consultant on site viability matters. Full open book accounts will need to be seen.</p> <p><u>Head of Natural and Built Environment (Planning Policy Manager)</u> Points out that there is a fundamental planning policy objection to the proposal. There are adopted planning policies and a Supplementary Planning Document is in place to protect employment land and premises from being developed for other purposes. There is a more than adequate supply of land for housing purposes that are not subject to flooding. Residential development on the site could impose constraints on adjacent nearby commercial premises that have not previously existed.</p> <p><u>Suffolk Wildlife Trust</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although the applicant refers to extending the adjacent Sudbury Common Land County Wildlife Site, there is no formal proposal or management plan to support this. If no formal proposal is available a management plan should be a condition of any permission. • There are records of otter and water vole abutting the site. It is unclear whether the survey relates to these areas. A specific survey should be undertaken. • It is noted that the survey found no evidence of bats in the trees to be removed. The development should follow good practice measures in case bats have colonised following the survey. <p><u>Third Party Representations</u> Twenty-nine letters of support have been received which all make the same comment.</p> <p><i>'Following recent consultation and the planning application submitted by Sandhurst New Homes for residential development at Bulmer Road, we wish to express our support of said scheme. Whilst we understand this land is allocated for employment use, we do not think it is appropriate in this residential area and support the alternative use as residential. We understand that the design of the final scheme is a reserved matter and would like to comment on this when the subsequent application for the design is submitted.'</i></p>
3	30-32	<p><u>Nayland with Wissington Parish Council</u> No objection subject to the wooden shed and Fox Cottage remaining as one planning unit (i.e. the shed should not become a separate property).</p> <p><u>Local Highway Authority</u> No objection</p>
4	33-36	<p><u>Great Cornard Parish Council</u> No objection</p>

Item No	Page	Summary
		<p><u>Public Rights of Way Officer (SCC)</u> No objection but comments that Public Footpath No. 4 is within the vicinity of the development site but does not appear to be directly affected by it.</p>
5	37-43	<p><u>Holbrook Parish Council</u> Support the application.</p> <p><u>Mr P Tetlow</u> Supports the application with the following comments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considers the only change to the external profile will be the replacement of the corrugated roof with slate or tiles. • Access and traffic would not be a problem and the additional activity generated by the new dwelling would be negligible • The usefulness of the barn to agriculture has past and the upkeep is somewhat onerous. The decay of the barn would be detrimental to the area. <p><u>Mr and Mrs Seel</u> Support the application with the following comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed development would benefit the character and aesthetics of the Green. • The building is an important feature to the Green. • The proposed plans are sympathetic and will retain the character of the barn and the presence of the building on the Green for years to come. <p><u>Mrs B Collinson</u> Supports the application with the following comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The buildings require considerable renovation work. The only viable way forward would be to change them into a residential dwelling. • The barn is unlikely to be used for agriculture again. • The plans have been sympathetically drawn and will not change the outlook for neighbouring houses or the surrounding countryside. • The development proposed is preferable to allowing the barn to deteriorate.

13 January 2009