

# LONG MELFORD PARISH COUNCIL

The Parish Offices, Cordell Road, Long Melford, Suffolk CO10 9EH  
Tel: 01787 378084 Email: clerk@longmelford-pc.gov.uk



## Planning Committee Minutes of Meeting

Meeting called for: **6:30pm, Thursday 6<sup>th</sup> May 2021**

Location: **Conducted by remote by videoconferencing due to the COVID-19 pandemic.**

Councillors present: **I. Bartlett, R. Delderfield, J. Ewbank, C. Michette, R. Michette, L. Tipper  
D. Watts, J. Watts (Chair)**

Councillors absent: **J. Lines** (on an authorised leave of absence)

Also attending: **D. Lovelock** (Parish Clerk)

Details of the Planning Applications and Planning Decisions listed in these Minutes can be found by visiting the Babergh District Council website at <https://planning.baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/> and typing the relevant DC reference number into the 'Simple Search' tool.

**The Chair opened the meeting at 6:32pm. The following Agenda items were addressed.**

### **PL21/05-1 Apologies for Absence**

No apologies for absence were received.

### **PL21/05-2 Declarations of Interest & Requests for Dispensation Regarding Items on the Agenda**

No declarations of interest were received.

No requests for dispensation were received.

### **PL21/05-3 MOTION: Accuracy of Minutes**

Resolved, that the Committee confirms the accuracy of the Minutes for the Planning Committee Meeting held 1<sup>st</sup> April 2021, and that the Chairman authorises the Clerk to apply the Chairman's signature to them electronically.

### **PL21/05-4 Public Participation**

No members of the public spoke to participate in the meeting.

### **PL21/05-5 MOTION: To Decide Upon the Council's Response to Planning Applications Advised by Babergh District Council**

- i. **DC/21/00021 Cricket Club, Meeting Field, Long Melford, Suffolk CO10 9JT**  
Planning Application - Erection of timber barn-style shed to enclose existing metal containers.  
**Resolved, that the Council supports the application.**
- ii. **DC/21/01686 63 Hall Street, Long Melford, Sudbury, Suffolk CO10 9JR**  
Planning Application - Change of use of shop with living accommodation to 1no. dwelling.  
**Resolved, that the Council supports the application.**
- iii. **DC/21/02138**  
**DC/21/02139 Cherrytree Cottage, The Green, Long Melford, Suffolk CO10 9DH**  
Householder application & application for Listed Building Consent - Removal of a mid-century lean-to built against a Victorian wash-house outbuilding.  
**Resolved, that the Council supports the application.**

JPW

- iv. **DC/21/02256 21 St Catherines Road, Long Melford, Suffolk, CO10 9JU**  
Householder application - Erection of single storey rear extension. New ground floor bay window to front of dwelling. New dormer to rear of roof. Erection of outbuilding/storage garage to rear.  
**Resolved, that the Council supports the application.**
  
- v. **DC/21/02293 Melford Hall, The Green, Long Melford, Suffolk CO10 9AA**  
Application for Listed Building Consent - Replace oil-fired boiler with mains gas boilers. Replace original exterior boiler room door with matching door including natural ventilation to meet regulatory requirements.  
**Resolved, that the Council supports the application.**
  
- vi. **DC/21/02312 7 Chapel Green, Little St Marys, Long Melford, Suffolk CO10 9HX**  
**DC/21/02313**  
Householder Application & application for Listed Building Consent - Installation of replacement windows to rear elevation.  
**Resolved, that the Council supports the application.**
  
- vii. **DC/21/02319 Land to the east of Station Road, Long Melford, Suffolk CO10 9HP**  
Submission of Details (Reserved Matters) and Discharge of Conditions 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22 and 24 under Outline Planning Permission DC/18/00606. Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for the erection of 150no dwellings and associated infrastructure.  
**Resolved, that the Council will make a detailed response regarding the Application (attached as Appendix 1), to be prepared by Cllr D. Watts and Mr I. McDonald.**
  
- viii. **DC/21/02356 Cherrytree Cottage, The Green, Long Melford, Suffolk CO10 9D**  
Application for works to trees in a Conservation Area - Reduce (T1) 1No White Cherry Blossom by up to 2m clearing branches by phone cables. Reduce (T2) 1No Hawthorn Tree to ground level. Reduce (T3) Laurel Hedge to same height as gate posts. Reduce 1No Elm Tree(T4) by up to 2m. Cut back (T5) Conifers along boundary and patio area by up to 2m to retain shape.  
**Resolved, that the Council supports the application.**
  
- ix. **DC/21/02468 Melbrook, Hall Street, Long Melford, Suffolk CO10 9JQ**  
Application for works to a tree in a Conservation Area - Fell 1No (T1) Yew Tree, leaning on boundary walls down to root growth and access to drive limited due to stem getting larger.  
**Resolved, that the Council supports the application.**

**PL21/05-6 The following Planning Decisions made by Babergh District Council were noted**

- a. **DC/20/03505 Norbury, Westgate Street, Long Melford, Sudbury Suffolk CO10 9DS**  
Householder Planning Application - Erection of extension to garage.  
**PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED**
  
- b. **DC/20/04203 34 Raile Walk, Long Melford, Sudbury, Suffolk CO10 9EG**  
Householder Planning Application- Erection of single storey rear extension.  
**PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED**
  
- c. **DC/20/05267 Jason House, The Green, Long Melford, Sudbury, Suffolk CO10 9DT**  
Application for Listed Building Consent - Enlargement of rear extension.  
**WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT**
  
- d. **DC/21/00110 Wardens Office, Sheltered Housing, Steeds Meadow, Long Melford Sudbury Suffolk**  
Planning Application - Change of use and conversion of Guest Room/Office to form 1no. additional sheltered housing flat.  
**PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED**

- e. **DC/21/00197 Parsonage Farm Barn, Cranmore Green Lane, Long Melford, Suffolk CO10 9AG**  
 Planning Application - Change of use and conversion of existing grain and machinery store into 1no. dwellinghouse and ancillary cart lodge to include storage space for vehicles, sundry items and a private office space.  
**PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED**
- f. **DC/21/00669 Potters Tye Farm, Newmans Green, Acton, Sudbury, Suffolk CO10 0AD**  
 Full Planning Application - Conversion of and extension to building to provide 1No dwelling for agricultural worker.  
**PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED**
- g. **DC/21/01128 Allotment House, Smaley Lane, Long Melford, Sudbury, Suffolk CO10 9JH**  
 Householder Planning Application - Erection of single storey rear extension and first floor side extension.  
**PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED**
- h. **DC/21/01267 Westgate House, Westgate Street, Long Melford, Sudbury Suffolk CO10 9DR**  
**DC/21/01268**  
 Householder Application & Application for Listed Building Consent. Erection of a garden pavilion adjacent to the existing garden wall.  
**WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT**
- i. **DC/21/01297 Mersea House, 7 Church Walk, Long Melford, Sudbury, Suffolk CO10 9DN**  
 Application for Listed Building Consent - Installation of internal wall insulation.  
**LISTED BUILDING CONSENT GRANTED**
- j. **DC/21/01379 12 Harefield, Long Melford, Sudbury, Suffolk CO10 9DE**  
 Householder Application - Erection of two storey rear extension.  
**PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED**
- k. **DC/21/01688 Cherrytree Cottage, The Green, Long Melford, Sudbury Suffolk CO10 9DH**  
 Application for Listed Building Consent - Remove cement-based render from rear and side elevations and replace with traditional hair lime render.  
**LISTED BUILDING CONSENT GRANTED**
- l. **DC/21/01780 12 Clopton Drive, Long Melford, Suffolk, CO10 9LJ**  
 Householder Planning Application - Erection of a porch extension.  
**PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED**

### **PL21/05-7 Bloor Homes Skylark Fields Development Report**

Cllr D. Watts & Mr I. McDonald provided an update regarding the progress of the development and matters directly pertaining to the recently received Planning Application (DC/21/02319 above). This was received and noted by the Committee.

### **PL21/05-8 Details of the Next Meetings**

It was confirmed that the next Planning Committee Meeting would be held at **7:00pm, Thursday 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2021.**

Signed:                     *John Watts*                      
**J. Watts**  
**Chair, LMPC Planning Committee**

Date:           03/06/2021

# Appendix 1

## Bloor Homes, Submission of Details, 150 Homes East of Station Road, Long Melford, Ref: DC 21/02319

### Representation Submitted by Long Melford Parish Council (LMPC)

Bloor Homes (BH) consulted LMPC prior to the submission of the details and so far LMPC have met with BH on three occasions. LMPC recognise that outline consent (for 150 homes and access to Station Road) has already been granted subject to 24 conditions and to a number of s.106 obligations. LMPC expressed a willingness to support the detailed application if BH would take seriously some of the concerns and ambitions of the parish. The meetings have been open and for the most part collaborative.

LMPC recognise that in deciding applications for planning consent “the authority shall have regard to (a)the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application, (aza)a post-examination draft neighbourhood development plan, so far as material to the application,” (section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990), and “If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.” (section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004)

In the light of the above LMPC has considered the BH proposals against the provisions of:

1. Core Strategy, Babergh DC, 2014 and the Saved Policies of the Local Plan 2006 (CS)
2. The Draft of the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan which has been submitted for Examination (Regulation 22), (JLP)and
3. The Long Melford Neighbourhood Plan, Regulation 15, Submission Draft (LMNP); whilst the LMNP has not been through examination, it has been through local consultations and a Strategic Environmental Assessment; it should be accorded some weight as a source of local evidence and views.

This representation is divided into three parts:

1. Proposals by BH which we support and on which we are seeking re-assurance that they will be covered in the approved details.
2. Issues which we hold to be important for a sustainable scheme, but to which BH have yet to agree.
3. Items in the s.106 agreement and/or the conditions, which we would like to see varied, but to which other authorities, Suffolk CC and Babergh DC, would need to agree.

1. Proposals by BH which we support and on which we are seeking re-assurance that they will be covered in the approved details.

### *Landscaping and Ecology*

The proposed landscaping for the site will include a wildflower meadow and new trees. On the western side there are attenuation basins, lots of trees, shrubs and hedging (but not at the boundary with the Melford Walk). All trees will be native and sourced locally. There will be a reptile fence and a post and rail fence at the edge of the Melford Walk. All the attenuation basins will be shallow, usually not full of water and accessible to residents.

A management company (funded by the residents) will be appointed to maintain the communal areas and will work to a plan issued by BH. Robert Eburne (Regional Planning Manager of BH) said the management company would be appointed in conjunction with Babergh DC.

The play area is now planned to be towards the north-west of the site and will be fenced off and have play equipment suitable for older children as well as toddlers.

Ecology: there will be bat boxes, bird boxes, swift boxes, four plots for skylarks and a hedgehog highway.

2. Issues which we hold to be important for a sustainable scheme, but to which BH have yet to agree.

The plan is to build the development with 10% less CO2 emissions than is required in the current version of Building Regulations, including fitting a special type of gas boilers that produce fewer emissions. The condition attached to the outline consent requires a reduction of **at least** 10%. A 10% reduction falls short of at least 10% and LMPC consider that BH's proposal is not ambitious enough and that Bloor should take measures to reduce CO2 emissions further. This view is supported by the JLP.

Policy LP25 of the JLP provides: "All new residential development is required to: Achieve reductions in CO2 emissions of 19% below for the Target Emissions Rate of the 2013 Edition of 2010 Building Regulations (Part L)"

BH should build a system for grey water recycling into their plan. Policy LP28 of the JLP supports this view: "Development will be supported where it:

1. Conforms to the principle of Holistic Water Management including the use of appropriate water efficiency and re-use measures, together with surface water drainage which provides community and environmental benefits;"

The plan for the development shows a number of dead end roads, which appear to be designed to facilitate further development to the east of the site. Whilst BH say they have no interest in additional development, the landowner has already shown their interest in development of their land (the current proposal). LMPC suggest that, subject to a very limited provision to allow the farmer to access the land to the east, all the roads leading to the site boundary should be designed to allow only turning and access to the adjacent housing.

LMPC is developing a network of defibrillators throughout the village and requests that BH provide one of an approved type at the entrance to the site.

#### [Layout and Contribution to Local Character](#)

LMPC is acutely conscious that the health of Long Melford (economically and socially) depends, among other things, on an amazing heritage of buildings, mainly housing:

- A pre-C19th historic stock which is varied but harmonious.
- C19th terraces such as Station Road and St Catherine's Road.
- Distinctive and enduring private developments at Harefield and Roman Way.
- An example of Radburn layout in Shaw Road.
- Attractive garden village, arts and crafts housing in Cordell Road.

- More recent developments, such as Orchard Brook and Elms Croft have sought to provide variety in form and materials and in layout.

The site in Station Road is very conspicuous at the important southern entry to the village and LMPC is disappointed that the proposals do not represent a high quality addition to the scene. Whilst the open space at the entrance is welcome, it has the air of being leftover space. LMPC have proposed to BH, and BH agreed to consider it, that a square or other structured space be provided at the entrance, a space that would be soft not hard landscaping. This would connect the development with the village and provide a facility for the residents of the development and of the village – an important link which is currently lacking.

Policy CS15 of the CS has a sharp focus on sustainable development, which is expressly endorsed at para 7 of NPPF (“The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development”):

Policy CS15: Implementing Sustainable Development in Babergh

“Proposals for development must respect the local context and character of the different parts of the district,..... All new development within the district, will be required to demonstrate the principles of sustainable development..... and in particular, and where appropriate to the scale and nature of the proposal, should:

- i) respect the landscape, landscape features, streetscape / townscape, heritage assets, important spaces and historic views;
- ii) make a positive contribution to the local character, shape and scale of the area;

LMPC have been shown no evidence, in spite of having asked BH for it, that these important features of local character, landscape, streetscape have been considered or have influenced the layout and design of the proposals. This is a major development in a village that is renowned for its attractive heritage, streetscape and landscape features; it should be making “a positive contribution to the local character, scale and shape of the area.”

Policy LP19 of the JLP reinforces the need for proposals to integrate positively with the landscape, to respect local distinctiveness and the identity of individual settlements.

Policy LM8 of the LMNP states:

Major (more than ten residential units or more than 0.5 hectares) development proposals should be accompanied by an assessment, which takes into account firstly any cumulative impact taken with other existing commitments in the village, secondly the cumulative impact of different aspects of the proposal and which demonstrates:

- That the scale and character of the proposal respects the landscape, landscape features, streetscape/town scape, heritage assets, important spaces, entry points to the village and historic views into and out of the village;
- The proposal will make a positive contribution to the local character, shape and scale of the area.....

The consistency of the message in these policies quoted from the three plans indicates that their provisions should be respected, regardless of whether two of the plans are not yet adopted or made. BH confirmed to the LMPC that they have read the LMNP. The submitted documents do not demonstrate that BH have respected or contributed to the local setting.

## Housing Mix

BH say in their Design and Access Statement, para 3.2 that “The majority of the development is two-storey in height with pockets of single-storey bungalows.” But only six single-storey properties are shown in 3.3 Accommodation Schedule.

The housing mix proposed by BH does not respond at all to the housing needs identified in the LMNP; in Long Melford there is (Census 2011) a significantly higher proportion of people aged 65 or over: 26.8% compared with 21.4% in Babergh and 16.3% in England. Households in Long Melford are skewed towards single-person households aged 65 and over: 19.5% in the parish, 14.1% in Babergh and 12.4% in England. The Residents Survey conducted for the LMNP recorded preferences for different types of housing; the following types attracted more than 50% of respondents saying they were needed or very much needed:

- Bungalows 58%
- Two-bedroom houses 70%
- Three-bedroom houses 58%
- Sheltered housing 56%

Over 70% said that four-bedroom houses were not needed or not much needed.

This all indicates a need for smaller dwellings in locations accessible to village services (the accessibility of this site was agreed at the appeal). And yet BH is proposing that over half (51 out of 97) the houses for open market sale will be 4-bedroom properties. This proportion should be significantly reduced, with more bungalows and two- and three-bedroom houses.

The LMNP has allocated two highly accessible sites for smaller housing for older residents but they are small; there is still an outstanding need. Policy LM11 provides for the inclusion of smaller market housing within proposed schemes, such as this one. These locally identified needs and Policy LM11 should be taken into account in the housing mix that is required in Condition 5.

At our 12 April meeting BH agreed that the example houses shown on their consultation brochure and website were not what they intended to build on the main road through the development. They said they would provide much more variety including bungalows and varied facades and treatments. But their Design and Access statement doesn't show much variety and we think it is important that there should be more.

3. Items in the s.106 agreement and/or Conditions, which we would like to see varied, but to which other authorities, Suffolk CC and Babergh DC, would need to agree.

Condition 19 of the outline consent requires BH to provide **improved bus stops and shelters** with real time bus movement information. LMPC consider this to be an expensive requirement given the low level of passenger ridership on buses through Long Melford; it is also an unpopular proposal with local residents. Of much greater value to the community would be a zebra pedestrian crossing: in spite of the 30 mph speed limit, the traffic moves quickly on this stretch of the B1064<sup>1</sup>, which carries a large volume of through traffic travelling from the south to Cavendish, other villages west

---

<sup>1</sup> Surveys carried out by LMPC and recorded the Draft Neighbourhood Plan, Appendix 5, show average daily volumes on the B1064 of 6373 vehicles southbound and 6495 northbound. 50% of northbound traffic exceeded the speed limit by more than 5 mph, and 86% of southbound traffic exceeded the speed limit by more than 5 mph

of Long Melford, Haverhill and Cambridge. Furthermore the volume of pedestrian movement at the southern end of the village has increased with the development of Elms Croft (77 dwellings) and the volume will increase further with the proposed development on the Station Road site (150 dwellings) and with two proposals in the Draft Neighbourhood Plan: in Borley Road (10 dwellings) and on Rodbridge Hill (30 dwellings). Going north to the village centre there is no crossing or refuge until you reach the Conservation Area in Little St Mary's. Policy LM7 of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan requires the developer to submit proposals for ensuring safe crossing for pedestrians. LMPC ask that SCC hold off implementation of the bus shelter requirement, whilst the case for a pedestrian crossing to serve the southern end of the village is examined; if the case is made, the funds due to be used for shelters could be applied to a new crossing. LMPC is prepared to assist with traffic counts and other surveys in order to facilitate examination of the case.

BH is required to make a site available for **Early Years provision** and a site has been identified by BH on the layout plan. BH are also required to provide about £180,000 for the same facility. LMPC believe this to be an inappropriate provision on two main grounds:

- This would be an isolated site with no existing facilities (office, staff room, WC's, security); it is likely to be expensive to build and to maintain, given the need to create all the overhead facilities for a small group of children.
- There is land available at Long Melford Primary School, which offers a number of advantages for increasing early years provision for Long Melford:
  - The site is available.
  - The new facility would be accessible to the existing infrastructure of the school.
  - The Head of the school, which already has nursery facilities, is keen integrate new early years provision with the school – the transition to upper parts of the school is easier if the children are already familiar with the school and the staff.
  - The school is in a very accessible location next to the middle of the village and the school is a well-known facility in the community: it is where you go as a young child to start your education.

LMPC urge SCC and BDC to consider relocating this facility to the existing school, where land is available and the facility would benefit from the established infrastructure of staff and facilities.

The outline planning consent requires BH to put hoggin on the surface of certain footpaths adjacent to the site. LMPC consider this a poor and unnecessary investment. LMPC suggest that the funds be applied to another amenity.