

# The Hadleigh Society

*Caring about Hadleigh - yesterday, today and tomorrow*

Kathryn Oelman  
Senior Planning Officer  
Planning Dept  
Babergh District Council  
Corks Lane, Hadleigh  
IP7 6SJ

Margaret Woods, Chair,  
The Hadleigh Society  
8 Watermill Close, Layham  
Ipswich IP7 5LD  
01473 823798  
[chair@hadsoc.org.uk](mailto:chair@hadsoc.org.uk)

*06 February 2017*

Dear Kathryn,

## Response from the Environmental & Planning Group of the Hadleigh Society to Planning Application B/16/01701, 7 Bridge Street Hadleigh

Please find attached the response from the Environmental and Planning Group of the Hadleigh Society to the amendments to Planning Application B/16/01701 re erection of 2 no. dwellings (following demolition of the existing bungalow) at Greenways No. 7 Bridge Street Hadleigh

These comments are submitted on behalf of the Hadleigh Society, one of whose aims is:- *“to protect and enhance Hadleigh’s heritage and environment by supporting and promoting high standards in planning, conservation, regeneration and development of features deemed to be of historical or environmental significance in the town.”*

We thank you very much for your attention in this matter.

Yours sincerely,

*Margaret Woods*

Margaret Woods  
Chair of the Hadleigh Society

**Report from the Environmental & Planning Group of the Hadleigh Society**  
**concerning**  
**PLANNING APPLICATION B/16/01701**  
**Greenways 7 Bridge Street Hadleigh**

These underwritten comments are submitted on behalf of the Hadleigh Society, one of whose aims is:- *“to protect and enhance Hadleigh’s heritage and environment by supporting and promoting high standards in planning, conservation, regeneration and development of features deemed to be of historical or environmental significance in the town.”*

Having studied the amendments to Planning Application B/16/1701, the Society considers the serious objections raised in its initial response to this application have in no way been addressed. The concerns outlined below should therefore be read in conjunction with the Society’s original comments.

**Loss of amenity to neighbours through overlooking**

The obscure glazing terrace balcony panels may safeguard privacy by minimising overlooking of some neighbouring properties but totally fail to prevent unreasonable overlooking and loss of privacy to the private sitting out area of Plot 2 by occupants of Plot 1.

**Adverse effect highway safety and amenity due to inadequate on-site parking / manoeuvring**

The off street parking facilities for 4 bedroomed properties would normally require 3 spaces per dwelling. Where no on-street parking facilities are available, it is even more essential that adequate off street parking is provided. The scheme shows two spaces for plot 1 and one space for Plot 2. Whilst both plots have garages, these appear to be below the minimum necessary internal dimensions to be treated as usable off street parking spaces. Thus a deficiency of 3 off street spaces remains.

In addition to inadequate parking, no improvement to the turning and manoeuvring space for vehicles on site, particularly in regard to Plot 2, has been made. The turning facility meets neither the basic requirements for a domestic dwelling nor provision of a type G turning area normally required in such arrangements as adopted policy. The Highway Authority has indicated that provision of both adequate on-site space for the parking and manoeuvring of vehicles is essential where on-street parking and manoeuvring would be detrimental to highway safety for users of the highway main classified Bridge Street.

**Inappropriate and incongruous scale, mass and design of the buildings.**

There has been no amelioration in the impact and appearance of the proposed development and therefore it remains out of scale with adjoining buildings and completely out of keeping with the character and appearance of nearby listed buildings, some of which are Grade II\*. The buildings will be clearly seen from Bridge Street.

The suggested planting, presumably to provide some form of screening of the development, appears somewhat crude and naive as the silver birch trees are proposed to be planted too close to each other and to the old historic red brick boundary walls; the extensive evergreen laurel hedging would result in considerable loss of garden area and undermining of the old boundary walls - all without achieving any meaningful screening of the development

**Harms the setting of Listed Buildings and Conservation Area**

No alteration has been made to diminish the harm to the setting of designated Listed Building heritage assets within the Conservation Area.

Bearing in mind the recent judgement *“Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Ltd v East Northamptonshire District Council & Ors”* [2014] EWCA Civ 137, this clearly requires the statutory duty imposed by

section 66(1), to be paramount in the Council's decision where it must have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed buildings, or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. Additionally the contribution the setting in question makes, does not depend on there being an ability to access or experience the setting by the public. Thus arguments of a development not causing substantial harm being a reason to enable the granting of planning permission are not sustained in law. There would need to be exceptional circumstances to override allowing harm to the heritage assets; no exceptional circumstances are provided in this case. Historic England has raised similar concerns.

**Continued lack of evidence of a high degree of sustainability** – Whilst harm to a Conservation Area may exceptionally be set aside, in this instance it is considered there is no convincing provision of any exceptional sustainability elements to meet para 137 of the NPPF. That paragraph requires planning proposals to make a positive contribution to enhance or better reveal their significance; this proposal, by admission of the application documents, does not meet that criterion.

Report of the Environmental & Planning Group of the Hadleigh Society  
6<sup>th</sup> February 2017