

Councillor Matthew Hicks declared a non-pecuniary interest in applications DC/18/04059 and DC/18/04191 as the County Councillor for the area.

73 DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING

All Members declared that they had been lobbied on application DC/18/05021.

All Members apart from Councillor John Matthissen declared that they had been lobbied on application DC/18/04059.

74 DECLARATIONS OF PERSONAL SITE VISITS

Councillor Sarah Mansel declared a personal site visit for application DC/18/04191.

75 NA/18/17 CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 19 DECEMBER 2018

It was resolved that the Minutes of the meeting from the 19 December 2018 were confirmed and signed as a true record.

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

The Governance Support Officer notified the Committee that one petition had been received and had been validated with 147 signatures. The 147 signatories supported the following statement:

"I the undersigned, object to the planning application to build 126 properties on the land adjoining Tuffs Road & Maple Way." The Applications referenced within the petition were DC/18/01777 & DC/18/05021.

The Governance Support Officer advised Members that the petition had been received only a few days before the Committee meeting and as such had not yet been reported to Council, but that this would take place at the next available meeting.

77 NA/18/18 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

| Application Number | Representations From |
|---------------------------|--|
| DC/18/05021 | Tom Morris (Eye Town Council) Jon Betts (Objector) Joe O' Sullivan (Agent) |
| DC/18/04049 | Kathie Guthrie (as Clerk to the Parish Council) John Mackenzie (Objector) Dale Scott (Applicant) |

78 DC/18/05021 LAND ADJOINING TUFFS ROAD AND MAPLE WAY, EYE

78.1 Item 1

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Application Proposal | DC/18/05021 Outline planning application (some matters reserved) – residential development for up to 126 dwellings and associated infrastructure including access. |
| Site Location Applicant | EYE- Land Adjoining Tuffs Road and Maple Way, Eye Peter, Sylvia, and Andrew West & Future Habitats Ltd |

78.2 The Case Officer presented the application to the Committee outlining the proposal before Members, the layout of the site, the tabled papers before Members and the Officer Recommendation of Approval. The Officer clarified that there was a duplicate application (DC/18/01777) that had been submitted to the Council and that the Applicant was currently in the process of applying for a non-determination appeal to the Planning Inspectorate.

78.3 The Case Officer responded to Members' questions on issues including: the current position of the Eye Neighbourhood Plan and that no weight could be given to the Plan as it had not yet been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate and that this was clearly stated in the NPPF and NPPG.

78.4 The Case Officer responded to further questions from Members' on issues including: the connectivity of the site via cycle routes, the estimated walking times to the Town Centre and the school, the heritage impact of the proposal, and the footpath adjoining the site.

78.5 At the request of the Committee, the Case Officer advised Members of the weight of the planning documents relevant to the application.

78.6 The Senior Development Management Engineer from Suffolk County Council's Highways Department responded to Members questions on issues including: that an updated travel plan had not been submitted but that this could be submitted in a reserved matters application if Members were minded to approve.

78.7 The Case Officer responded to further questions on issues including: the withdrawal of Permitted Development rights (PD) from the proposal, and that archaeological services were satisfied.

78.8 Members considered the representation from the Parish Council representative, Tom Morris.

78.9 The Parish Council representative responded to Members' questions on issues including: how the Applicant had not engaged with the Parish Council.

78.10 Members considered the representation from the Objector, Jon Betts.

78.11 The Objector responded to Members' questions on issues including: the footpath and cycle routes on the roads surrounding the application site.

78.12 Members considered the representation from the Agent, Joe O' Sullivan.

78.13 The Agent responded to Members' questions on issues including: that engagement had not been conducted on the outline proposal, and that the detailed design and orientation of the houses would be submitted at the reserved matters stage.

78.14 The Senior Development Management Highways Engineer from Suffolk County Council outlined the response that the Highways Authority had provided.

78.15 The Highways Engineer responded to Members' questions on issues including: the access through Oak Crescent to the site, and that the accesses would have to be built to the Highways Authority Standard.

78.16 Members considered the representation from Councillor Nick Gowrley who was temporarily representing the Ward on behalf of the Late Councillor Michael Burke.

78.17 Members debated the application on the issues including: what options were available in terms of providing further information regarding the highways accesses and the possibility of a second opinion, the lack of engagement from the applicant, and the possibility of the proposal having an emergency access.

78.18 Councillor John Field Proposed that the application be Deferred for the following reasons:

1. Members are not assured that impacts from the development, capacity and safety can be mitigated to an acceptable degree. Details also not sufficient to understand amalgamated impact on Oak Crescent. To ensure principles of NPPF paras 108b and c, 109 and 110c are upheld officers are asked to seek a further opinion on the scheme from Suffolk County Council.
2. On receipt of further opinion, the application is to return to either Referrals or Development Control at the Chair's choice for consideration.
3. It was also expressed that the removal/reduction of use in respect of the Maple Way (southern access) for vehicular use should be explored without being prejudicial to any decision on the application. Should any amendment of the application take place on this basis, consultation will need to take place with all parties and neighbours prior to any presentation of case to members.

78.19 Councillor John Matthissen Seconded the motion.

78.20 By 8 votes to 0 with 1 abstention.

78.21 RESOLVED

The application was deferred for the following reasons:

1. Members are not assured that impacts from the development, capacity and safety can be mitigated to an acceptable degree. Details also not sufficient to understand amalgamated impact on Oak Crescent. To ensure principles of NPPF paras 108b and c, 109 and 110c are upheld officers are asked to seek a further opinion on the scheme from Suffolk County Council.
2. On receipt of further opinion, the application is to return to either Referrals or Development Control at the Chair's choice for consideration.
3. It was also expressed that the removal/reduction of use in respect of the Maple Way (southern access) for vehicular use should be explored without being prejudicial to any decision on the application. Should any amendment of the application take place on this basis, consultation will need to take place with all parties and neighbours prior to any presentation of case to members.

79 DC/18/04059 CYDER HOUSE, ASPALL GREEN, ASPALL, STOWMARKET

79.1 A short comfort break was taken between 11:26-11:32.

79.2 Item 2

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Application | DC/18/04059 |
| Proposal | Full planning application- Erection of a process building, loading bay canopy and sub-station, including the relocation of existing storage tanks and construction of new concrete pads to allow the installation of new storage tanks, gantry and other ancillary equipment. |
| Site Location | ASPALL- Cyder House, Aspall Green, Aspall, Stowmarket |
| Applicant | Plandescil Ltd on behalf if Aspalls |

79.3 The Case Officer presented the application to the Committee outlining the proposal before Members, the layout of the site, and that the Officer Recommendation was for Approval.

79.4 The Case Officer responded to Members' questions on issues including: the impact on the listed building, where the existing tanks would be moved to and the proposed landscaping on the site.

79.5 Members considered the representation from Councillor Kathie Guthrie acting as the Parish Clerk.

79.6 Councillor Guthrie responded to Members' questions on issues including: the responses received in the village.

79.7 Members considered the representation from the Objector, John Mackenzie.

79.8 Members considered the representation from the Applicant, Dale Scott.

79.9 The Applicant responded to Members questions on issues including: the employment that would be created by the development, that the lighting on the site would be low energy and would be directed downwards and the, HGV traffic created by the proposal.

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

79.11 The Ward Member responded to Members' questions on issues including: the traffic movements at the main entrance of the site.

79.12 Members debated the application on the issues including: the traffic issues surrounding the site, that some of the issues raised were pre-existing problems within the area, the proposed landscaping on the site, and the investment into a local business.

79.13 Councillor Lesley Mayes Proposed that the application be approved as detailed in the Officer Recommendation with the additional conditions:

1. Lighting to be agreed
2. 10 year retention of landscaping scheme

79.14 Councillor Lavinia Hadingham Seconded the motion.

79.15 Members continued to debate the application on the issues including: the harm caused to the landscape and the benefits to the local economy.

79.16 By a unanimous vote

79.17 **RESOLVED**

(1) That Members grant planning permission for the development as submitted under this planning application.

(2) conditions as summarised below and those as may be deemed necessary by the Acting Chief Planning Officer:

- Time limit
- Approved plans
- Final approval of a landscaping scheme, including investigation of additional

- tree planting at the boundary of the site with Aspall Hall
- Requirement for a construction management plan
- Control over hours of site preparation/construction works/measures for the control of dust and waste and provision of security lighting or floodlighting
- Development being carried out in accordance with submitted Arboricultural report
- Development being carried out in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment and details of SuDS
- Agreement of a Construction Surface Water Management Plan and method statements

Additional Conditions:

- Lighting to be agreed
- 10 Year retention of landscaping scheme

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

- Future upgrades to the treatment works may require planning permission
- Responsibility for the safe development of the site lies with the developer
- Works to a watercourse may require consent under section 23 of the Land Drainage Act
- Discharge to a watercourse or groundwater needs to comply with the Water Environment Regulations 2003

80 DC/18/04191 LAND TO THE REAR OF THE LEAS, QUOITS MEADOW, STONHAM ASPAL, STOWMARKET, IP14 6DE

80.1 Item 3

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Application Proposal | DC/18/04191 Outline Planning Application (Access to be considered) – Erection of up to 5 no. dwellings and construction of new access |
| Site Location | STONHAM ASPAL- Land to the rear of The Leas, Quoits Meadow, Stonham Aspal, Stowmarket, IP14 6DE |
| Applicant | Mr R Tydeman |

80.2 The Case Officer presented the application to the Committee outlining the proposal, the layout of the site, the previous application that had come before the Committee in the previous year and that the Officer Recommendation was for approval.

80.3 The Case Officer responded to Members questions on issues including: that the entirety of the house was proposed to be demolished, that the landscaping considerations would form part of a reserved matters application.

80.4 At the request of Members, the Area Planning Manager summarised the outcome the planning appeal for application DC/17/04419.

80.5 A question was raised regarding the red line plan before Members as it did not encompass the entirety of the house or the proposed access to the site.

80.6 After reviewing the red line plan, the Area Planning Manager and Planning Lawyer advised Members that they could not proceed any further with the application until this had been resolved.

80.7 **RESOLVED**

The application was withdrawn by Officers and deferred to the MSDC Development Control B Meeting on 30.01.2019 to seek a corrected red line site plan.

81 SITE INSPECTION

81.1 None requested.

The business of the meeting was concluded at 12.49 pm.

.....
Chair