

BABERGH DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BABERGH PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD IN COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNCIL OFFICES, CORKS LANE, HADLEIGH ON WEDNESDAY, 19 JULY 2017

PRESENT: Nick Ridley - Chairman

Sue Ayres	Simon Barrett
Peter Beer	Sue Burgoyne
David Busby	Derek Davis
Alan Ferguson	John Hinton
Michael Holt	Adrian Osborne
Stephen Plumb	David Rose
Ray Smith	

Kathryn Grandon was unable to be present.

24 SUBSTITUTES

It was noted that, in accordance with Committee and Sub-Committee Procedure Rule No 20, a substitute was in attendance as follows:-

Simon Barrett (substituting for Kathryn Grandon)

25 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

None declared.

26 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 21 June 2017 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

27 TO RECEIVE NOTIFICATION OF PETITIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COUNCIL'S PETITION SCHEME

None received.

28 QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC

None received.

29 QUESTIONS BY COUNCILLORS

None received.

30 SITE INSPECTIONS

Further to the Committee's decision on 5 July to hold a site inspection for Application No. B/16/01092/OUT (Minute No 21 refers) a site inspection Panel was appointed.

RESOLVED

That a Panel comprising the following Members be appointed to inspect the site:-

**Sue Ayres
Peter Beer
Sue Burgoyne
David Busby
Derek Davis
Alan Ferguson
Kathryn Grandon**

**John Hinton
Michael Holt
Adrian Osborne
Stephen Plumb
Nick Ridley
Ray Smith**

31 PLANNING APPLICATION FOR DETERMINATION BY THE COMMITTEE

In accordance with the Council's arrangements for Public Speaking at Planning Committee, representations were made as detailed below relating to Paper PL/17/7 and the speakers responded to questions put to them as provided for under those arrangements:-

Application No.

B/17/01059

Andrew Wade (Parish Council)
David Lay (Applicant)
John Ward (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) a decision on the item referred to in Paper PL/17/7 be made as follows:-

POLSTEAD

Application No B/17/01059/FUL
Paper PL/17/7 – Item 1

Full application – Erection of detached dwelling with double cartlodge and construction of new vehicular access, land north of Wood View, Stackwood Road.

The Case Officer, Melanie Corbishley, confirmed that there were no updates to the report, and that the application was the same as Application No B/16/01542 which was the subject of a delegated refusal dated 12 January 2017.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be refused for the following reasons:-

- 1. In the absence of a five year land supply, the Council should consider the development against the three strands of sustainable development as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development and, with respect of development in rural areas, states that housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities and avoid new isolated homes unless there are special circumstances as set out under Paragraph 55.**
- 2. Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy sets out the District's settlement policy and states that most new development will be directed sequentially to the towns/urban areas, core villages and hinterland villages. The site of the proposed dwelling is in the countryside, outside of any town or village, and accordingly applications for residential development in the countryside will not normally be permitted and new housing will be integrated into existing settlements. Policy CS15, in line with the NPPF, requires all new development to demonstrate the principles of sustainable development as applied to the local context and states, inter alia, that an appropriate level of services, facilities and infrastructure are available to serve the development.**
- 3. The application fails to identify special circumstances to justify an isolated dwelling in the countryside, contrary to paragraph 55 of the NPPF. Moreover, the proposal would not be sustainably located, would not enable access to services, facilities and infrastructure and would not minimise the need to travel by car. Consequently, it would not accord with Policies CS1, CS2 and CS15 which seek to support sustainable development, or with the NPPF when taken as a whole. Therefore, whilst the proposal would make a modest contribution to the supply of housing and would deliver a limited and short term contribution to the economic role of sustainability through the construction activity, the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal. As such, the proposal would not amount to sustainable development and so is not supported by the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in Framework paragraph 14 or Policy CS1.**

The business of the meeting was concluded at 10.10 a.m.

.....
Chairman