

## MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE A** held in the King Edmund Chamber - Endeavour House, 8 Russell Road, Ipswich on Wednesday, 19 December 2018 -09:30

### **PRESENT:**

Councillor: Matthew Hicks (Chair)  
Lesley Mayes (Vice-Chair)

Councillors: Gerard Brewster Diana Kearsley  
Anne Killett Sarah Mansel  
Wendy Marchant Jill Wilshaw

### **Ward Member(s):**

Councillors: Kathie Guthrie

### **In attendance:**

Officers: Acting Chief Planning Officer (PI)  
Planning Lawyer (IDP)  
Area Planning Manager (JPG)  
Transport Policy and Development Manager – Suffolk County Council  
Highways Authority (SM)  
Head of Environment Strategy – Suffolk County Council – (MH)  
Planning Strategy Manager – Suffolk County Council – (JC)  
Governance Support Officer (RC)

## **61 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE/SUBSTITUTIONS**

Apologies of absence were received from Councillors David Burn, John Field, Lavinia Hadingham and David Whybrow.

Councillor Wendy Marchant Substituted for Councillor John Field.

Councillor Jill Wilshaw substituted for Councillor Lavinia Hadingham.

## **62 TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY OR NON-PECUNIARY INTEREST BY MEMBERS**

Councillor Matthew Hicks declared a non-pecuniary interest in application DC/17/06293 as the County Councillor for the area.

**63 DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING**

All Members declared that they had been lobbied on application DC/17/06293.

With the permission of the Chair, Councillor Gerard Brewster addressed the Committee outlining that a large number of emails had been received lobbying Members but that a small number of these emails had contained inappropriate comments and had been passed on to the Monitoring Officer.

**64 DECLARATIONS OF PERSONAL SITE VISITS**

Councillors Jill Wilshaw and Kathie Guthrie declared a personal site visit for application DC/17/06293.

**65 NA/18/15 CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 21 NOVEMBER 2018**

It was resolved that the Minutes of the meeting from 21 November 2018 were confirmed and signed as a true record.

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

None received.

**67 NA/18/16 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

In accordance with the Council's procedure for public speaking on planning applications a representation was made as detailed below:

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>Representations From</b>
DC/17/06293	Stephen Palframan (Debenham Parish Council) Chantal Haddon (Objector) Paul Bradford (Supporter) Mark Chapman (Applicant) James Bailey (Agent) Cllr Kathie Guthrie (Ward Member)
1866/17	Jonathan Miller (Old Newton with Dagworth Parish Council) Rob Hall (Objector) Lionel Thurlow (Agent) Alex Turner (Agent) Cllr Jill Wilshaw (Ward Member)

---

**DC/17/06293 LAND TO THE NORTH OF, GRACECHURCH STREET,  
DEBENHAM, SUFFOLK**

## 68.1 Item 1

Application Proposal	DC/17/06293 Outline Planning permission (all matters reserved except for access immediately from the public highway), for: the erection of up to 295 dwellings, 2ha for potential primary school site/education use or community/care use, and two new vehicular accesses from Gracechurch Street, together with associated developments including flood alleviation and attenuation features for wider mitigation and separate SuDS for site; associated public open space and landscaping; and other infrastructure and utilities.
Site Location	<b>DEBENHAM</b> - Land to the North of, Gracechurch Street, Debenham, Suffolk
Applicant	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

68.2 The Case Officer started presenting the application to Members but was stopped by the Chair as Councillor Diana Kearsley joined the meeting at 09:46.

68.3 On advice from the Planning Lawyer and Governance Officer it was resolved that the Case Officer would begin their presentation from the beginning so that Councillor Kearsley could take part in application DC/17/06293.

68.4 Councillor Kearsley declared that she had no declarations pecuniary or non-pecuniary interest, that she had been lobbied on application DC/17/06293 and that she had not undertaken any personal site visits.

68.5 The Case Officer presented the application to the Committee outlining the proposal, the layout of the site, the Officer Recommendation of approval, the contents of the late papers before Members, that 10 representations from neighbours had been made but that they did not raise any further planning issues within the report, and that the Officer recommendation had been amended in condition 21 to amend the highway condition to agree a timescale.

68.6 The Acting Chief Planning Officer advised Members that before them was an extract of the Draft Debenham Neighbourhood plan which contained the views that were identified as significant.

68.7 The Planning Lawyer advised Members of the contents of the briefing note on the post examination draft Neighbourhood Plan which commented on the weight that should be attached to this plan at its current stage and the relevance of the current housing land supply position to this issue.

68.8 At the request of the Chair and the Acting Chief Planning Officer, the Head of

Environment Strategy for Suffolk County Council gave a short presentation on the on the impact that the proposal would have on the flooding situation in Debenham with the creation of the attenuation basins controlling the flow of water in the event of a flood. He concluded that if Members were minded to approve the application the flood provision would form part of a strategic solution to flooding in Debenham.

68.9 At the request of the Chair and the Acting Chief Planning Officer, the Transport Policy and Development Manager for Suffolk County Council's Highways Department gave a short presentation on the range of measures that formed the mitigation package as part of the proposal.

68.10 At the request of the Chair and the Acting Chief Planning Officer, the Planning Strategy Manager for Suffolk County Council gave a short presentation on the education provision associated with the scheme including the reserved land for educational use.

68.11 At the request of the Chair the Planning Lawyer and the Acting Chief Planning Officer advised the Committee as to the guidance in the NPPF on prematurity in the light of concerns that the timing of the consideration of this application may be prejudicial to the emerging Neighbourhood Plan when it was close to adoption.

68.12 The Transport Policy and Development Manager from Suffolk County Council's Highways Department responded to Members' questions on issues including: pavement widths and parking along Gracechurch Street, the implication of parking restrictions on Little London Hill, Coach parking in and surrounding the Leisure centre, and pedestrian crossings associated with the proposed site.

68.13 The Case Officer responded to Members' questions on issues including: that the examiner of the Debenham Neighbourhood Plan had removed some of the policies that were contained within the original submission. The Acting Chief Planning Officer also advised Members (in response to a question) that although the Aecom report for the Neighbourhood Plan had discounted the current site, the work that was undertaken for a planning application was more detailed and expansive.

68.14 The Case Officer and the Transport Policy and Development Manager from Suffolk County Council responded to further questions from Members' on issues including: the location of the speed limit changes in the village, the possibility of a reduction of the speed limit, the anticipated dispersal of traffic from the site.

68.15 The Case Officer and Head of Environment Strategy for Suffolk County Council responded to Members questions on issues including: the betterment provided regarding flooding, that the flooding data was the most up to date available.

68.16 Members considered the representation from the Chair of Debenham Parish

Council, Steve Palframan.

68.17 The Parish Council representative responded to Members questions on issues including: the length of time to create the Neighbourhood Plan, parking, and traffic movements within Debenham.

68.18 Members considered the representation from the Objector, Chantal Hadden.

68.19 Members considered the representation from the Supporter Paul Bradford.

68.20 Members considered the representation from the Applicant and Agent, Matt Chapman and James Bailey

68.21 The Applicant and Agent responded to Members' questions on issues including: the relationship between the application before Members and the Neighbourhood Plan, the market viability of the proposal.

68.22 Members considered the representation from the Ward Member, Councillor Kathie Guthrie.

68.23 A short comfort break was taken between 11:43-12:00

68.24 Members debated the application on the issues including: the scale of the development, that there were benefits within the proposals for schools, roads and flooding, the size and narrowness of pavements, the identified views within the Neighbourhood Plan and the judgement of weight regarding said plan.

68.25 Members continued to debate the application on issues including: the importance of Neighbourhood Planning and the engagement from the community, the proposed traffic mitigation measures and the anticipated effects of this, the scale of the development compared to the size of Debenham, and the visual impact on the designated views within the Neighbourhood Plan.

68.26 Members continued to debate the application on issues including: the betterment that could be provided from the investment associated with the proposal, the situation of the Neighbourhood Plan being so near to completion, and views that had been seen from the site visit.

68.27 Councillor Diana Kearsley proposed that the application be refused against the Officer Recommendation on the grounds that:

1. The application would adversely and unacceptably impact upon the natural, built and historic environment of Debenham and would cause serious harm to the key features and future enjoyment by the community of highly valued views 1, 2, 3 and 11 over this open valley landscape. The proposal would inappropriately introduce significant built development and activity into this valley slope and in particular the upper valley side and ridgeline of the Gracechurch Street area. This would compromise the communities ability to enjoy highly valued views over this landscape in the long term. The application would be contrary to policies DEB14

(Landscaping) and DEB19 (Views) of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan which has been successfully Examined and is proceeding to Referendum and is a significant material consideration which weighs against the development. The proposal would thus be contrary to the principles of Core Strategy 2008 policy CS5, Core Strategy Focused Review policy FC1.1, saved policy GP1 of the 1998 Local Plan and paragraph 170 National Planning Policy Framework in failing to protect and enhance the local character of a valued landscape and would cause adverse impact which significantly and demonstrably outweighs the benefits of the development when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework taken as a whole.

The application would be contrary to the principles of policy DEB1 in delivering up to 295 new dwellings when the emerging Neighbourhood Plan anticipates around 316 dwellings and a windfall allowance of approximately 54 dwellings. The scale of development now proposed would be disproportionate relative to the level of growth allocated and planned for in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan and would foreseeably prejudice the plan making process by undermining the importance of a plan-led approach in safeguarding this valley landscape and ensuring that key features of Views 1, 2, 3 and 11 can continue to be enjoyed. This scheme would moreover deliver nearly double the amount of growth expected by the community in Debenham which is central to the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. Granting planning permission at this point in time would be premature and undermine community confidence in the plan making process after successful Examination but in advance of a referendum on that Plan contrary to paragraphs 49 and 50 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Add Informative Note:

Committee were concerned that the development would fail to provide good pedestrian routes off site in Gracechurch Street and fail to provide adequate pedestrian links into the village centre. The Committee considered that safe, inclusive and accessible access would not be available contrary to paragraph 91, 127(f) of the NPPF and policy DEB2(d) of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.

68.28 Councillor Wendy Marchant seconded the motion.

68.29 A short break was taken between 12:45- 12:51 to clarify the reasons provided for refusal with the acting Chief Planning Officer.

68.30 The Acting Chief Planning Officer confirmed the reasons for Refusal with the Proposer and Secunder.

68.31 By 7 votes to 1

68.32 **RESOLVED**

**Refuse Planning Permission for the following reasons:**

**1. The application would adversely and unacceptably impact upon the natural,**

built and historic environment of Debenham and would cause serious harm to the key features and future enjoyment by the community of highly valued views 1, 2, 3 and 11 over this open valley landscape. The proposal would inappropriately introduce significant built development and activity into this valley slope and in particular the upper valley side and ridgeline of the Gracechurch Street area. This would compromise the communities ability to enjoy highly valued views over this landscape in the long term. The application would be contrary to policies DEB14 (Landscaping) and DEB19 (Views) of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan which has been successfully Examined and is proceeding to Referendum and is a significant material consideration which weighs against the development. The proposal would thus be contrary to the principles of Core Strategy 2008 policy CS5, Core Strategy Focused Review policy FC1.1, saved policy GP1 of the 1998 Local Plan and paragraph 170 National Planning Policy Framework in failing to protect and enhance the local character of a valued landscape and would cause adverse impact which significantly and demonstrably outweighs the benefits of the development when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework taken as a whole.

2. The application would be contrary to the principles of policy DEB1 in delivering up to 295 new dwellings when the emerging Neighbourhood Plan anticipates around 316 dwellings and a windfall allowance of approximately 54 dwellings. The scale of development now proposed would be disproportionate relative to the level of growth allocated and planned for in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan and would foreseeably prejudice the plan making process by undermining the importance of a plan-led approach in safeguarding this valley landscape and ensuring that key features of Views 1, 2, 3 and 11 can continue to be enjoyed. This scheme would moreover deliver nearly double the amount of growth expected by the community in Debenham which is central to the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. Granting planning permission at this point in time would be premature and undermine community confidence in the plan making process after successful Examination but in advance of a referendum on that Plan contrary to paragraphs 49 and 50 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Add Informative Note:**

Committee were concerned that the development would fail to provide good pedestrian routes off site in Gracechurch Street and fail to provide adequate pedestrian links into the village centre. The Committee considered that safe, inclusive and accessible access would not be available contrary to paragraph 91, 127(f) of the NPPF and policy DEB2(d) of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.

**69 1866/17 FINNINGHAM ROAD, OLD NEWTON**

69.1 Item 2

Application Proposal	1866/17 Outline planning application with access, landscaping and layout to be considered for the erection of up to 56 dwellings (NOTE- reduced to 47 dwellings) with vehicular access from Finningham Road, Old Newton. Appearance and Scale to be the subject of a Reserved Matters application.
Site Location Applicant	<b>OLD NEWTON-</b> Finningham Road, Old Newton. Mr M Stearman on Behalf of the Stearn Family Trust

69.2 The Case Officer presented the application to the Committee outlining the proposal, the layout of the site, and the tabled papers that were before Members from Historic England regarding the Scheduled monument.

69.3 Members considered the representation from Jonathan Miller representing Old Newton with Dagworth.

69.4 The Parish Council representative responded to Members' questions on issues including: whether Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funds had been used to create a footpath. The Parish Council confirmed they had been unsuccessful in doing so due to land ownership issues.

69.5 Members considered the representation from Rob Hall, Objector.

69.6 Members considered the representation from Lionel Thurlow, Agent.

69.7 Members considered the representation from the Ward Member, Councillor Jill Wilshaw.

69.8 Members debated the application on the issues including: the parking layout of the proposal, the distance from the site to the school, the historical significance of the scheduled monument and that the Tree Officer did not object to the proposal.

69.9 Councillor Gerard Brewster proposed that the application be approved as detailed in the Officer Recommendation subject to the following amendments:

1. That subject to [a] an acceptable landscaping scheme and [b] a revised parking layout being provided to the satisfaction of the ACPO that authority be delegated to the ACPO upon completion of a satisfactory Section 106 legal

agreement on the following terms:

- Affordable housing

And that subject to [1] that PP be granted subject to the conditions under [2]

Add Condition: Scheme of hydrology monitoring , management and mitigationTBA

69.10 Councillor Wendy Marchant seconded the motion.

69.11 By 5 votes to 2

69.12 **RESOLVED**

- (1) That subject to [a] an acceptable landscaping scheme and [b] a revised parking layout being provided to the satisfaction of the Landscape Architect, that authority be delegated to the Acting Chief Planning Officer upon completion of the legal agreement subject to conditions as summarised below and those as may be deemed necessary by the Corporate Manager:**

**Affordable Housing**

- (2) And that subject to [1] that Planning Permission be granted subject to the conditions under [2]:**
  - 47 Units only
  - Time limit
  - Approved Plans
  - Landscaping concurrent with reserved matters
  - Garages to be used only for parking of vehicles/storage of household items
  - PD Removals for roof extensions and rooflights.
  - Works to comply with ecological enhancements
  - Development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment and balancing pond containment.
  - Visibility splays and other Highways conditions.
  - Water connection to the network
  - Archaeology
  - Tree Protection
  - Unexpected contamination
  - Layout to exclude parking space at plot 25.

**Additional Condition:**

- Scheme of Hydrology monitoring, management and mitigation to be agreed.

**(3) And the following informative notes as summarised and those as may be deemed necessary by the Acting Chief Planning Officer:**

- **Pro active working statement**
- **Standard informatives**

**(4) That in the event of the landscaping scheme referred to in Resolution (1) above not being secured within 6 months that the Acting Chief Planning Officer be authorised to refuse the application on appropriate grounds.**

**(5) That in the event of the Planning obligations referred to in Resolution (1) above not being secured within 6 months that the Acting Chief Planning Officer be authorised to refuse the application on appropriate grounds.**

**70 SITE INSPECTION**

70.1 None requested.

The business of the meeting was concluded at 1.50 pm.

.....  
Chair