

GREAT BEALINGS PARISH COUNCIL

www.greatbealings.co.uk

*Clerk to the Council: Mrs Dee Knights
Dunure, 57 Dobbs Lane
Kesgrave, Ipswich, IP5 2QE
Tel:01473 624240
Email:greatbealingspc@hotmail.co.uk*

20th July 2016

Head of Planning and Coastal Management
Suffolk Coastal District Council
Melton Hill
WOODBIDGE
Suffolk IP12 1AU

For the Attention of Katherine Scott

Dear Sirs,

Wood Barn Cottages: DC/16/2777/PN3 and DC/16/2808/PN3

We note these further applications in respect of the Wood Barn site and wish to **object** to both proposals. Our comments are in respect of the site as a whole, and in relation to the specific applications noted above.

1. General Comments

- The site is within the Neighbourhood Area set for the Great Bealings Neighbourhood Plan (the Plan), which has now been formally submitted to SCDC and is out for statutory consultation. The Plan fully endorses the status of Great Bealings as an 'other village' under SP28 of the SCDC Local Plan which means that it is considered in effect as part of the countryside without any of the infrastructure that would support increased development.
- The Wood Barn site had two dwellings on it prior to its acquisition by the applicant and there is no justification for increasing that number of dwellings on the site.
- We note that the applicant's proposal to construct an additional access route onto Lodge Road has been allowed at appeal. We consider that the inspector made a material error of fact when he compared Lodge Road to Seckford Hall Road. The latter is highly restricted and now has single direction egress onto the A12, whereas Lodge Road carries a significant level of traffic at peak times, both Ipswich 'rat run' traffic and school traffic, and becomes extremely dangerous due to its narrowness and blind corners. We have always opposed the new access route for these reasons and this new application demonstrates all too clearly why we have been concerned at increased traffic accessing Lodge Road on a dangerous bend. Such risks will be increased if further

applications for development are allowed on the Wood Barn site (see below).

- The Plan under Policy BE1 calls for the use of sympathetic materials and design which should “respect the character and quality of the village and its setting in the landscape and enhance the surrounding area.” The proposed development, perforce, so as to meet the objections to the previous application which was refused at appeal (DC/14/1941), ignores any attempt to provide a sympathetic approach to new development in the context of the Plan and its policies and proposes an extremely severe treatment and use of materials wholly out of keeping with the area.
- It is not clear why two applications have been submitted. We assume this is to consider two approaches to the issue of design. There is no cross-referencing however so it very hard to check. We consider multiple applications on this basis to be misleading.
- We consider the development to be wholly inappropriate for these reasons.

2. Specific Comments

- There is confusion between 2777 and 2808 in that the site plan attached to 2777 shows ‘Barn C’ as the object of the application, whereas the Ecological Appraisal attached to 2808 clearly shows the same building as ‘Barn A’. Given the previous history of applications on this site, this could lead to a serious error of interpretation.
- The same appraisal (page 1 – para1.1) contains a map of the site and the surrounding area. Blunt’s Wood, a County Wildlife Site, is clearly shown to the north of the site. On page 5 (para 3.2.2 (b)) it states that there is no CWS within a kilometre – contradicting its own site plan.
- We do not accept that a full and proper survey of bats has been carried out. This must be done by Suffolk Wildlife Trust or equivalent to ensure that it is done at the right time of year and collects the appropriate evidence. The area has a substantial population of bats and a formal survey should be carried out.
- A drawing of the site showing the new access road is also appended. This shows **THREE** houses on the existing site, not allowing for **ANY** of the barns to be converted. We have objected to the proposal to move the house on Plot 2 onto the horse grazing area specifically to ensure that such overdevelopment does not occur. Clearly this demonstrates that the applicant intends to maximise the use of the site in contravention of SCDC’s Local Plan policies and in contravention of the policies set out in the Neighbourhood Plan.
- The application seeks to compare the proposed development with other sites in SCDC’s area which have been allowed. This ignores the issue of context, setting, and landscape, all of which should be considered in relation to the current proposal.

- The proposed development as described in 2808 (para 3.4, page 16) states that the enclosed curtilage surrounding the building to be converted is equal to the area occupied by the building. The plan attached to the proposal (P 149-3-22.06.2016) shows quite clearly that this is not the case. Even if we were minded to support the proposal the very limited space around the building – we assume forced by the desire to apply for further conversions of the remaining barns in the future – makes the setting and context of the building highly restricted. There would be no room for parking, garden, other amenities, etc. on the basis proposed.
- We have not sought to address the complex issues of structural integrity and whether or not the proposed treatment and use of the existing steel frame meets the requirement of permitted development or not, but we would urge SCDC to consider this issue with care.

In summary we remain opposed to further applications on this site which we consider to threaten a gross over-development of the area which cannot be substantiated by the Local Plan or by the Neighbourhood Plan.

Yours sincerely

Dee Knights

Clerk to Great Bealings Parish Council