

## **Minutes of an Extraordinary Meeting of Bures St Mary Parish Council held on Wednesday 29<sup>th</sup> June 2022 at Bures Primary School at 7.30pm**

**Present:** Cllrs J Aries, T Fairbairn, G Jackson, J McCrory, L. Norton, S Pentney, S Sills, T Saer, J Finch (SCC)  
**In the Chair:** Cllr J Aries  
**Also Present:** Mrs J Wright (Clerk), 4 members of BHPC, 15 members of the public

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and presented the following statement: Parish Council meetings may be recorded, subject to the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014.

Bures St Mary Parish Council respectfully asks that if any individual intends to record or film this meeting or any part of it that they make this intention known to the Chair or the Clerk, before we continue.

Person or persons recording this meeting are reminded that the "Public Participation" period may not be part of the formal meeting and that they should take legal advice for themselves as to their rights to make any recording during that period. The Chair will need to see written authority of any claimed rights.

No intention to film or record the meeting was declared by those present.

We are here to consider Planning application – DC/22/00754 Former Chambers Bus Depot, Church Square, Bures St Mary CO8 5AB This is a Re-consultation concerning the amended drawings and additional information received on 10th June 2022.

### **1/06/22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies received from Cllr M Barrett (BDC) and Will Vote (Rose Builders).

### **2/06/22 REGISTER OF INTERESTS & DISPENSATION REQUESTS**

To declare any 'Pecuniary' or 'Non Pecuniary' interests and dispensation requests. No Register of Interests declared and no Dispensation requests put forward.

The Chair proceeded to outline to those present the semi-formal structure for this Extraordinary Meeting.

- As with the previous Extraordinary Meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> April, names have been taken of those wishing to speak. If you reconsider and decide that you would like to speak during the public forum, please raise your hand at a convenient point.
- There is a 15-minute session for members of the public to put forward their views. The time allowed can be extended at the discretion of the Chair. We have noted that no public comments have been made online during this reconsultation period.
- There is 3 -minute allowance for each speaker.
- Please give the parish in which you reside prior to speaking. No names will be recorded in the minutes
- To make the most effective use of the allocated time, if a previous speaker has covered all the points that you wished to raise, please state your agreement but try to avoid repeating what has already been said.
- Try not to interrupt someone when they are speaking.

- All comments should be addressed to the Chair.
- The Public Forum will then conclude and thereafter a member of the public may only speak at the discretion of the Chair.
- The entire meeting should be concluded within 2 hours if possible.

#### **Reasons for the Re-consultation of DC/22/00754**

- Following the Extraordinary Meeting in April, the Parish Council submitted its response to Babergh, strongly objecting to the application on highway safety grounds.
- This was substantiated by the submission of an independently acquired Highways assessment written by Mr Berriman of the Highway Traffic and Transport Consultancy (HTTC). It was this report, funded by some members of the community, which triggered the revision of the plans for the Church Square/ Bridge Street junction.
- It is important to stress that without this report, any challenges lodged by the Parish Council to the Highway safety of this proposal would have carried very little weight, if any at all. Consequently, any subsequent objection based on road safety fears will also require an independent view substantiated by a suitably qualified engineer. Suffolk County Council Highways maintain that the proposal is acceptable, subject to a range of conditions and S106 contributions.
- The Parish Council also asked that the size of individual dwellings be reconsidered to provide smaller properties for starter homes or downsizing. This was supported by the Initial Housing Needs Survey, produced as part of the Neighbourhood Planning Process. As the NP is still being developed and has not yet been formally adopted, this point was not acknowledged. Rose Builders, not surprisingly, need to include the larger dwellings to cover the costs of making this brownfield site fit for purpose.
- The Parish Council also objected on the grounds of the proposed less-than-recommended parking provision for the retail outlet. Suffolk Guidance for Parking 2019 advises that destination parking figures are only advisory, rather than a requirement as used for origin parking such as for dwellings. SCC Highways would not approve any shortfall but recognised the improved pedestrian accessibility, the close proximity of residential areas, (details of cycle storage and EV charging will be subject to a planning condition) and have also considered the parking provision elsewhere in the area. SCC Highways maintain their position that the development will not be refused on Highway safety grounds.
- The Planning Officer for Babergh's stance is:
- The proposed development offers enhancements to non-vehicle accessibility with the improvements to pedestrian crossings and widening of pavements,
- The surrounding area around the site benefits from a generous amount of on-street parking provision, as well as a public car park a short distance from the site,
- 3no. visitor spaces as well as visitor cycle storage are proposed as part of the development.

### **3/06/22 PUBLIC FORUM – 15 minutes maximum public participation**

3 minutes for individual contributions unless agreed by the Chairman

9 members of the public chose to speak on Item 4 (a) of the agenda.

Comments of support for and objections to the development were put forward by residents of both Parishes.

One resident noted that they remained extremely concerned that the safety aspects of the junction have still not been fully addressed by the developer. They also objected to the unsightly bollards, increase in noise level, inappropriate proposed retail opening hours, loss of parking, SCC evidence of vehicle use to the site could be much higher than indicated, need for smaller housing.

One resident considered the developer has over estimated the number of dwellings which can comfortably fit on the site and no adjustment has been made to reduce dwelling size..

One resident raised concern that the developer has inaccurately assessed the level of traffic which will access the site as the B1508 is a through route for motorists.

One resident extremely concerned with the further loss of parking indicated on the revised junction design, questioned why the eastbound bus stop is located so close to the bend leading to the High Street, unsightly bollards, safety for residents using the crossings, proposed development within a conservation area and questioned who pays for the highway alterations.

One resident pointed out that the existing retail facility in the village does not fulfill the needs of a families' weekly shop or has suitable opening hours for early and late evening commuters. They considered more residents will shop locally thus creating a greener environment, onsite parking will allow residents to park and use other village facilities within the standard retailer limited parking zone.

One resident challenged this point - to be profitable the retailer will encourage through traffic shoppers and thus parking may often not be available.

One resident wanted a village retail facility which is accessible for all and considered the development offered this and is beneficial for those needing to do 'top up' shopping.

One resident extremely concerned at the loss of parking space Many properties within the vicinity of the site have none or limited on street parking with regular double parking issues in Church Square. Developer should revise its on site parking to ease issues with the on street parking.

One resident concerned that the revised layout did not take in to account the amount of larger vehicles which regularly travel through the village.

One resident in favour of the proposed retail development – the design provides for overnight vehicle charging, improves shopping facilities for the village, will bring local employment, predicts extra footfall rather than increase in traffic.

One resident disappointed that the developer hasn't satisfactorily responded to the parish councils' previous objections. Questioned why the need to widen the pavement, the siting of the crossing at Queen's House suggests vehicles may have to stop at the corner to allow pedestrians to cross, concerns raised regarding type of delivery retail lorry and number of deliveries to the site, assessment of surface water not addressed. Resident suggested a mini roundabout at the junction is preferable to the revised layout.

Input from the Chair during the Public Forum:

The former Chambers Bus Depot is a brownfield site. The BDC Local Plan requires the developer to provide premises to retain some employment opportunities on the site. The S106 Contributions received from the developer will meet legal costs of £11,500 and the costs of new junction layout.

The Chair thanked all speakers for their contributions and highlighted on the proposed Construction Management Plan and the Deliveries Management Plan:

*Condition: Before the development hereby permitted is commenced a Construction Management Plan shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Construction of the development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved plan. The Construction Management Plan shall include the following matters: a) parking and turning for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors b) loading and unloading of plant and materials c) piling techniques (if applicable) d) storage of plant and materials e) provision and use of wheel washing facilities f) programme of site and all associated works such as utilities including details of traffic management necessary to undertake these works g) site working and delivery times h) a communications plan to inform local residents of the program of works i) provision of boundary hoarding and lighting j) details of proposed means of dust suppression k) details of measures to prevent mud from vehicles leaving the site during construction l) haul routes for construction traffic on the highway network and m) monitoring and review mechanisms. n) Details of deliveries times to the site during construction phase.*

*Reason: In the interest of highway safety to avoid the hazard caused by mud on the highway and to ensure minimal adverse impact on the public highway during the construction phase.*

*Condition: All HGV delivery traffic movements to and from the site once the development has been completed, shall be subject to a Deliveries Management Plan which shall be submitted and approval in writing to the Local Planning Authority for approval. No HGV movements shall be permitted to and from the site other than in accordance with the vehicle types and routes defined in the Plan.*

*Reason: In the interests of highway safety, to ensure adequate servicing arrangements are provided for and to reduce or remove as far as is reasonably possible the effects of HGV traffic in sensitive areas.*

The Chair invited Cllr Finch to speak at this point.

Cllr Finch noted that Suffolk County Council Highway Officers deem the development meets the National Highways Regulations and the developer is entitled to follow the Appeal process if the application is refused by Babergh District Council.

He agreed to ask the Officers to clarify the interpretation of the Construction Management Plan and the Deliveries Management Plan. If the junction became a future accident blackspot then SCC would be required to monitor and address issues.

Questions from the public to Cllr Finch:

Could a lower speed limit through Bures help? *Can help but as in Stoke by Nayland this has not completely eased traffic issues.*

Traffic pollution would not be acceptable for Bures. *SCC recommends the Highway regulations but these are not required to be complied with when application is determined if other factors override.*

Could a mini roundabout be investigated? *Yes I will investigate.*

#### **4/07/22 PLANNING APPLICATION DC/22/00754 Re-consultation – Former Chambers Bus Depot, Church Square, Bures St Mary CO8 5AB**

The Chair asked the members to consider their response to the re-consultation and noted: The developers have considered Mr Berriman's HTTC report and made adjustments accordingly. SCC have applied a number of conditions (10) to the application but find the revised proposed access and junction layout represents an improvement over the previously submitted layout. All the conditions must be fully implemented and approved by the Local Planning Authority before the development is commenced or before it is brought into use or occupied, depending on the nature of the condition. Revisions to now be considered and response agreed by Monday 4<sup>th</sup> July. Members of the public should be aware that the opinion expressed by an individual councillor may not represent the views of the council and cannot be used to bind the council.

The Chair asked members for their priority concerns following those addressed by members of the public in the Public Forum:

- The parish council should remain consistent with regard to its previous response.
- Have all points been addressed by the developer?
- Must continue to press for the developer to provide the best junction design.
- Suggest a reduction in retail space which will provide a greater parking area.
- Ask SCC Highways if a mini roundabout is feasible.
- Parking is a priority and the parish council must ensure sufficient space is available.
- Overnight parking to be made available on site.
- Electric charging points to be available 24 hours.
- Bus stop on corner creating poor visibility for drivers turning into the High Street.
- Some on street parking can help reduce speeding traffic.
- Bus companies not keen to withdraw the current bus stop facility at Bridge Street but are considering moving the bus drivers stop over time to Colchester Road.

The Chair proposed the following matters to be included in the written response to Re-consultation DC/22/00754 and noted that the Grounds for Objection should make reference to the National Planning Policy Framework July 2021.

- To ensure the developer considers all possible options to ensure the safest road layout at the junction.
- To include the NHP Housing Needs Survey as evidence for the need for smaller properties.
- To request conservation style bollards.

- To request smaller size properties thus providing greater parking space on site and to address the parking loss.
- To raise concerns regarding the bus stop on the corner creating poor visibility for drivers turning into the High Street.
- To request a mini roundabout to be included in the junction design.
- To request a restriction in retailer opening hours.

Proposal seconded and unanimously agreed by all members present.

#### **5/07/22 BRIEF INFORMATION & EXCHANGE**

Members of the public noted that they had not been able to access the re-consultation on the planning portal and therefore had been unable to submit comments. Clerk to follow up with Babergh DC and to request an extension of time for the public to submit their responses.

#### **6/07/22 DATE OF NEXT PARISH COUNCIL MEETING**

Thursday 28<sup>th</sup> July to be held at The Garrad Room, Bures Community Centre at 7.30pm.

Future dates booked 2022: 22<sup>nd</sup> September, 17<sup>th</sup> November

Future dates booked 2023: 19<sup>th</sup> January, 23<sup>rd</sup> March, Joint APM – TBA, AGM 18<sup>th</sup> May,  
20<sup>th</sup> July, 21<sup>st</sup> September

The meeting closed at 9.30pm.

Signed:

Chair:

Date: