

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNCIL OFFICES, CORKS LANE, HADLEIGH ON WEDNESDAY 1 MARCH 2017 AT 9.30 A.M.

PRESENT: Peter Beer – Chairman

Sue Ayres	Adrian Osborne
Sue Burgoyne	Lee Parker
Dave Busby	Stephen Plumb
Tina Campbell	Nick Ridley
Derek Davis	David Rose
John Hinton	Ray Smith
Michael Holt	

100 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

None declared.

101 MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 1 February 2017 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

102 PETITIONS

None received.

103 QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC

None received.

104 QUESTIONS BY COUNCILLORS

None received.

105 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION BY THE COMMITTEE

Members had before them an Addendum to Paper S114 (circulated to Members prior to the commencement of the meeting) summarising additional correspondence received since the publication of the Agenda, but before noon on the working day before the meeting, together with errata.

In accordance with the Council's Charter for Public Speaking at Planning Committee, representations were made as detailed below relating to Item Nos 1 and 2 of Paper S114 and the speakers responded to questions put to them as provided for in the Charter:-

Application No.

Representations from

B/16/01581/RES
B/16/00955/FUL

James Griffiths (Agent for the Applicant)
Rhett Corcoran (Parish Council)
Dr David Hickie (Supporter)
Craig Beech (Agent for the Applicant)
Councillor Bryn Hurren (Ward Member)

RESOLVED

That subject to the imposition of conditions or reasons for refusal (whether additional or otherwise) in accordance with delegated powers under Council Minute No. 48(a) (dated 19 October 2004) decisions on the items referred to in Paper S114 be made as follows:-

(a) LONG MELFORD

**Application No. B/16/01581/RES
Paper S114 – Item 1**

Submission of details under PP B/15/00180/OUT – layout, scale, external appearance and landscaping for the erection of 77 dwellings with new vehicular and pedestrian accesses, parking and public open space, land north of Ropers Lane, Rodbridge Hill.

The Case Officer, James Platt, referred to two minor corrections to the report, as follows:-

Para 11 – materials layout to include the use of red brick to three (*not two*) dwellings on the site frontage

Para 28 – reference to ‘former mill buildings’ should read ‘former maltings’

In response to questions, Philip Isbell, Professional Lead – Growth and Sustainable Planning, confirmed that the applicant would still be bound by the conditions attached to the outline planning permission and that an informative to this effect would be attached to any permission granted for the submission of details under the original permission.

RESOLVED

(1) That planning permission be granted subject to the following condition:-

- **Development to be in accordance with the approved plans**

(2) That an informative note be added to the permission reminding the applicant of the need to discharge conditions pertaining to the outline planning permission B/15/00180/OUT.

(b) LINDSEY

**Application No. B/16/00955/FUL
Paper S114 – Item 2**

Full application – Erection of 1 detached dwelling and construction of new vehicular access, Lodge Farm, Kersey Road.

Prior to consideration of this application, Members took the opportunity to view a model of the proposed development, as supplied by the applicant's agent.

The Case Officer, Gemma Pannell, referred to the assessment of 'less than substantial harm' at the higher end of the scale and its impact on heritage assets, and Philip Isbell, Professional Lead – Growth and Sustainable Planning, drew Members' attention to the letter from Place Services, the Council's external Heritage Advisers, which had been circulated as the Addendum to Paper S114.

During the ensuing discussion, which included detailed consideration of the reasons for refusal as set out in the officer report, Member were advised in relation to the key issues posed by the application, which included the Policies applicable to the proposal as set out in paragraph 7 of the report together with the main considerations listed in paragraph 22.

Notwithstanding the officer recommendation to refuse planning permission for reasons relating to the proposed development being contrary to Policies CS2, CN06 and elements of the NPPF, a motion for approval was moved on the grounds that the proposal was innovative and exceptional and therefore not contrary to CS2, was sustainable (CS15), the design acceptable (CN01), and met CS17 in relation to rural business support.

Prior to a vote being taken on the motion to grant planning permission, the Chairman adjourned the meeting to seek further clarification from officers in relation to the impact on the heritage asset and the application of the relevant policies. As a result, the mover withdrew the tabled motion with the consent of the seconder and a motion to defer consideration of the application was read out in full by the Chairman and moved by him. The motion was duly seconded and carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED

That Committee is minded to approve Application No B/16/00955/FUL but in view of the need for further information concerning heritage and policy issues that the decision be deferred to allow a site visit on a date to be confirmed, and allow time for officers to engage in further consultation with Historic England, the Applicant and Agent to explore common ground and to comment upon policy related issues and report back to Committee with additional information in due course.

The business of the meeting was concluded at 11.45 a.m.

.....
Chairman