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, 24 July 2019 09:30

PRESENT:

Councillor: Matthew Hicks (Chair)
Lavinia Hadingham (Vice-Chair)

Councillors: Rachel Eburne
Richard Meyer
Mike Norris

Andrew Mellen
David Muller BA (Open) MCMI RAFA
Keith Welham

Ward Member(s):

Councillors: None

In attendance:

Officers: Area Planning Manager (GW)
Principal Planning Officer (VP/BH)
Development Management Planning Officer (AS)
Planning Lawyer (IDP)
Governance Officer (RC)

13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE/SUBSTITUTIONS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Sarah Mansel, John Field, and Wendy Turner.

Councillor Andrew Mellen substituted for Councillor Sarah Mansel.

Councillor Mike Norris substituted for Councillor John Field.

Councillor Keith Welham substituted for Councillor Wendy Turner.

14 TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY OR NON-PECUNIARY INTEREST BY MEMBERS

Councillor Mike Norris declared a non-pecuniary interest in application DC/19/00174 as he knew the applicant through his role as a District Councillor.

15 DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING

Councillor Richard Meyer declared that he had been lobbied on application DC/19/01554.
16 DECLARATIONS OF PERSONAL SITE VISITS

None declared.

17 NA/19/3 CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 26 JUNE 2019

It was resolved that the Minutes of the meeting from 26 June 2019 were confirmed and signed as a true record.

18 TO RECEIVE NOTIFICATION OF PETITIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COUNCIL’S PETITION SCHEME

None received.

19 NA/19/4 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Number</th>
<th>Representations From</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DC/18/02146</td>
<td>Item withdrawn by Officers prior to the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC/19/01602</td>
<td>Victoria Waples (Thurston Parish Council) Lydia Voyias (Agent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC/19/01554</td>
<td>James Tanner (Agent) Richard Meyer (Ward Member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC/19/01793</td>
<td>Nick Davey (Agent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC/19/00174</td>
<td>Georgina Knock (Applicant) Chris Knock (Applicant)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20 DC/18/02146 LAND TO THE NORTH AND WEST OF SCHOOL ROAD, ELMSWELL, SUFFOLK - ITEM WITHDRAWN BY OFFICERS

20.1 Item A

Application Proposal DC/18/02146 Outline Planning Application (access to be considered, all other matters reserved) – erection of up to 105 dwellings including car parking, open space provision with associated infrastructure and vehicular access.

Site Location ELMSWELL - Land to the north and west of school road, Elmswell, Suffolk

Applicant Christchurch Land and Estates (Elmswell South) Ltd

20.2 It was noted by the Chair that the application had been withdrawn by Officers after the agenda had been published but prior to the Committee meeting and as such would not be heard by the Committee.
**DC/19/01602 LAND ON THE NORTH SIDE OF NORTON ROAD, THURSTON**

21.1 Item B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>DC/19/01602</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Reserved Matters Application – Appearance, Scale, Layout, and Landscaping in respect of Phase 1 – Erection of 87 No residential dwellings (30 affordable), pursuant to outline planning permission 5070/16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>THURSTON – Land on the North side of Norton Road, Thurston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Linden Homes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21.2 The Case Officer presented the application to the Committee outlining the proposal before Members, the layout of the site, the additional conditions as advised by Suffolk County Council regarding Floods and Water, and the officer recommendation of approval with conditions.

21.3 The Case Officer responded to Members’ questions on issues including: the current weight Thurston Neighbourhood Plan, the proposed shared surfaces, that the balancing pond was outside of red line plan of the application, and the response from Suffolk Police.

21.4 Members considered the representation from Victoria Waples of Thurston Parish Council.

21.5 The Parish Council representative responded to Members’ questions on issues including: that the proposal did conform to the Neighbourhood Plan.

21.6 Members considered the representation from Lydia Voyias who spoke as the Applicant.

21.7 The Applicant responded to Members’ questions on issues including: that some of the houses did not meet National Space Standards, that electric car charging points would be provided in the garages, the proposed render, and that further conversations would take place regarding children’s play equipment.

21.8 Members considered the written representation from the Ward Member, Councillor Harry Richardson, which was read out by the Chair.

21.9 Members debated the application on the issues including: the design of the proposal, and National Space Standards.

21.10 Councillor Lavinia Hadingham proposed that the application be approved as detailed in the officer recommendation. Councillor Dave Muller seconded the motion.

21.11 Members continued to debate the application on the issues including: the
proposed shared surfaces, the ecological strategy, and the proposed public open spaces on the site.

21.12 By a unanimous vote.

21.13 RESOLVED

That:

(1) subject to the receipt of an appropriate unilateral undertaking from the applicant underpinning their offer to make a £65,000 contribution to SCC as local highway authority for the carrying out of footway improvements on Norton Road in the vicinity of the site, payable upon commencement of the development:

then;

(2) Delegated authority be given by the Committee to the Acting Chief Planning Officer to approve the reserved matters (under outline application reference 5070/16) subject to planning conditions, drafted to the satisfaction of the Acting Chief Planning Officer, including:

[not comprehensive at this stage]

- Approved Plans and Details
- Detailed site-specific construction management details.
- Further details of materials to be submitted
- External glazing bars and window reveals
- Double chimneys on pairs of properties in the Crescent
- No grp canopies
- All boundary walls to be 1.8m [not 1.5m] Connecting walls between frontages within the crescent to be 2.2m and to incorporate hedgehog gaps
- Electric charging points in garages
- Ecological enhancement details
- As required by SCC, where necessary.
- Further elevational treatment to plots 63 and 76 [Crescent]
- Introduction of elevated flanks to plots 1 and 21
- Railings to be provided on front boundary of properties in the Crescent
- Plots with no garage an external electrical connection

Additional Conditions
- Conditions from SCC Flood and Water.

22 DC/19/01554 LAND OFF HUNSTON ROAD, BADWELL ASH

22.1 Item C

Application DC/19/01554
Proposal Outline Planning Application (some matters reserved) – Erection of 52 No. dwellings and creation of new access road (re-submission of refused planning application DC/18/00465)

Site Location BADWELL ASH – Land off Hunston Road, Badwell Ash

Applicant Mr and Mrs Sutton

22.2 The Case Officer presented the application to the Committee outlining the proposal before Members, the layout of the site, the contents of the tabled papers, and the officer recommendation of approval with conditions.

22.3 The Case Officer responded to Members’ questions on issues including: the Affordable Housing provision, the current paths through the site and the Public Right of Way on the site, the connectivity of the site and the footpaths in the area.

22.4 Members considered the representation from James Tanner who spoke as the Agent.

22.5 The Agent responded to Members’ questions on issues including: that a footpath could be conditioned to provide access to the village.

22.6 Members considered the representation from Councillor Richard Meyer who spoke as the Ward Member.

22.7 The Ward Member responded to Members’ questions on issues including the bus services through the village, whether the footpath led to the bus stop.

22.8 Members debated the application on the issues including: the current status of Mid Suffolk’s Housing Land Supply, the access to the village, the visibility splay for the entrance, and the pathway being secured.

22.9 Councillor Dave Muller proposed that the application be approved as detailed in the officer recommendation with the additional condition to secure a footway connection through the site to meet the existing access to the village. Councillor Rachel Eburne seconded the motion.

22.10 By 5 votes to 1 with 1 abstention.

22.11 RESOLVED

That authority be delegated to the Acting Chief Planning Officer – Growth & Sustainable Planning to Grant Outline Planning Permission:

(1) Subject to the prior agreement of a Section 106 Planning Obligation on appropriate terms to the satisfaction of the Acting Chief Planning Officer – Planning for Growth to secure:

- Onsite delivery of 35% Affordable Housing
  Affordable Rent = 14 6 x 1 bed 2 person flats @ 50sqm;
4 x 2 bed 4 person flats @ 70sqm
2 x 2 bed 4 person houses @ 79sqm
2 x 3 bed 6 person houses @ 102sqm Shared Ownership = 4
3 x 2 bed 4 person houses @ 79sqm
1 x 3 bed 5 person house @ 93 sqm

• Onsite Public Open Space including management of the space to be agreed and requirement for public access at all times
• A financial contribution towards Primary and Secondary School Transport costs to the nearest schools.

(2) That the Acting Chief Planning Officer – Planning for Growth be authorised to Grant Outline Planning Permission upon completion of the legal agreement subject to conditions as summarised below and those as may be deemed necessary by the Acting Chief Planning Officer:

• Standard time limit – Outline
• Reserved Matters Required (Including market housing mix)
• Approved Plans and Documents (Plans and Documents submitted that form this application)
• Timetable for implementation and retention of Landscaping
• Those required by SCC Local Highway Authority
• Energy efficiency measures to be secured and agreed, as indicated
• Those required by the Council’s Ecological Consultants
• Those required by MSDC Tree Officer
• Those required by SCC Local Lead Flood Authority
• Those required by the Environment Agency
• Those required by MSDC Waste Management
• Those required by MSDC Environmental Protection Officers during construction phase of development
• Phasing Condition (To allow phasing of the development and allows spreading of payments under CIL)

(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
• SCC Highways notes
• Support for sustainable development principles
• Land Contamination Note
• Protected Species Note

(4) That in the event of the Planning obligations referred to in Resolution (1) above not being secured that the Acting Chief Planning Officer – Planning for Growth be authorised to refuse the application on appropriate grounds.

(4) 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 – Planning for Growth be authorised to refuse the application on appropriate grounds.

Additional Condition:

- To secure footway connection through the site to meet the existing access to the village.

**23 DC/19/01793 LAND AT BLACKACRE HILL, BRAMFORD ROAD, GREAT BLAKENHAM, SUFFOLK**

23.1 A short comfort break was taken between 11:30-11:40 after the completion of application DC/19/01554 and before the commencement of DC/19/01783.

23.2 Item D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Proposal</th>
<th>DC/19/01793</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submission of details under Outline planning permission 2351/16 (varied by section 73 permission 1755/17) for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of phase 2 extending estate road approved under DC/18/01897 to eastern &amp; central parts, provision of main services &amp; balancing lagoon &amp; phase 4 for central warehouse unit plot.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Location</th>
<th>GREAT BLAKENHAM – Land at Blackacre Hill, Bramford Road, Great Blakenham, Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Curzon De Vere Ltd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23.3 The Case Officer presented the application to the Committee outlining the proposal for the site, the layout before Members, and the officer recommendation of approval with conditions.

23.4 The Case Officer responded to Members’ questions on issues including: that there was an existing floods objection but that it was not relevant to the application before Members as it was being addressed via a discharge of condition, the proposed banding on the building, and the proposed lighting on the site.

23.5 Members considered the representation from Nick Davey who spoke as the Agent.

23.6 The Agent responded to Members’ questions on issues including: the parking provision for visitors, and the reasoning for the proposed coloured banding on the exterior of the building.

23.7 Members considered the written representation from the Ward Member, Councillor John Field, which was read out by the Chair.

23.8 Members debated the application on the issues including: the economic benefits of the proposal.
23.9 Councillor Dave Muller proposed that the application be approved as detailed in the officer recommendation. Councillor Mike Norris seconded the motion.

23.10 By a unanimous vote

23.11 RESOLVED

(1) That the Acting Chief Planning Officer – Planning for Growth be authorised to APPROVE Reserved Matters subject to conditions as summarised below and those as may be deemed necessary by the Acting Chief Planning Officer:

- Approved Plans (Plans submitted that form this application)
- Reserved Matters approval given in accordance with the terms of the outline planning permission relating to this site and the conditions attached thereto remain in force.

24 DC/19/00174 WELHAMS MEADOW, CHURCH ROAD, BATTISFORD, SUFFOLK

24.1 Item E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Proposal</th>
<th>DC/19/00174</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Application under Section 73 of the town and country planning act – variation of condition 3 (on going requirement of development: time restriction on holiday dwelling/s) of planning permission (0590/17) to allow for residential use on plots 1 and 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>BATTISFORD- Welhams Meadow, Church Road, Battisford, Suffolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>J E knock and Partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24.2 The Case Officer presented the application to the Committee outlining the proposal before Members, the layout of the site, and the officer recommendation of approval with conditions.

24.3 The Case Officer responded to Members’ questions on issues including: that 2 of the 4 units from the original permission had been built, the parking constraints on the site, that no evidence had been submitted regarding the marketing of the proposal as a holiday venue.

24.4 The Members considered the representation from the Applicant Chris Knock and Georgina Knock.

24.5 The Applicants responded to Members’ questions on issues including: the pre-application advice that had been given by Planning Officers, why one of the four units had not been constructed yet, and how far the nearest local amenities were.

24.6 Members considered the written representation from the Ward Member,
Councillor Daniel Pratt, which was read out by the Chair.

24.7 Members debated the application on the issues including: whether a residential building would have been approved in the area, the economic benefits via tourism of the holiday use, and the previous decisions that had been given by the Planning Inspector on similar cases.

24.8 The Area Planning Manager advised Members of the outcomes of appeals to the Planning on similar sites, and that as two of the dwellings had not been built that it would amount to having new dwellings on the site.

24.9 Members continued to debate the application on the issues including: the sustainability of the proposal, the economic loss to the area, and that the site was within a Site of Special Scientific Interest.

24.10 Councillor Dave Muller proposed that the application be refused for the following reasons:

These recently developed units, in one case not having been constructed would result in new residential development in the countryside contrary to CS1, CS2, FC1, FC1.1, would not constitute a sustainable form of development in the countryside and that the loss of these permitted holiday units would undermine the objective of safeguarding economic opportunities for the visitor and tourist economy of the District evidenced within the Councils visitor destination plan, Ipswich Area Sector Needs Assessment 2017 and Open for Business Strategy, contrary to Local Plan Policies H11 and RT19.

On this basis the application would fail to demonstrate that it would safeguard sustainable rural tourism contrary to NPPF paragraph 83C, and rural housing policies in paragraphs 77 and 78, with a new dwelling also being contrary to paragraphs 8 and 11 of the NPPF.

Moreover there is no evidence to demonstrate that this would be a form of rural housing which would be responsive to local circumstances, reflect local needs nor enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities having regard to the application documentation and its location poorly related to services and facilities whereby occupants would be expected to rely upon the private car to access relevant infrastructure, in particular education, healthcare and community facilities on a regular basis, not equivalent to the impacts identified with the holiday units.

In addition, the proposal would result in the loss of benefits from such units, which were identified as supporting the farm business and diversifying its income streams whilst supporting the angling club and other businesses in the area, as detailed in the supporting statement to the original application. It has not been demonstrated that the proposal would continue to offer these, or that the loss would be outweighed by any benefits of the proposal.

Whilst residential use would support services to some degree this would not have
the same benefits with regards to the farm business, angling club and tourism businesses specifically identified as benefitting during the application (0590/17), furthermore given the lack of sustainable access and impact on infrastructure it is considered that the proposal would have adverse impacts not outweighed by benefits, contrary to the NPPF.

24.11 Councillor Lavinia Hadingham seconded the motion.

24.12 By 7 votes to 0 with 1 abstention.

24.13 RESOLVED

These recently developed units, in one case not having been constructed would result in new residential development in the countryside contrary to CS1, CS2, FC1, FC1.1, would not constitute a sustainable form of development in the countryside and that the loss of these permitted holiday units would undermine the objective of safeguarding economic opportunities for the visitor and tourist economy of the District evidenced within the Councils visitor destination plan, Ipswich Area Sector Needs Assessment 2017 and Open for Business Strategy, contrary to Local Plan Policies H11 and RT19.

On this basis the application would fail to demonstrate that it would safeguard sustainable rural tourism contrary to NPPF paragraph 83C, and rural housing policies in paragraphs 77 and 78, with a new dwelling also being contrary to paragraphs 8 and 11 of the NPPF.

Moreover there is no evidence to demonstrate that this would be a form of rural housing which would be responsive to local circumstances, reflect local needs nor enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities having regard to the application documentation and its location poorly related to services and facilities whereby occupants would be expected to rely upon the private car to access relevant infrastructure, in particular education, healthcare and community facilities on a regular basis, not equivalent to the impacts identified with the holiday units.

In addition, the proposal would result in the loss of benefits from such units, which were identified as supporting the farm business and diversifying its income streams whilst supporting the angling club and other businesses in the area, as detailed in the supporting statement to the original application. It has not been demonstrated that the proposal would continue to offer these, or that the loss would be outweighed by any benefits of the proposal.

Whilst residential use would support services to some degree this would not have the same benefits with regards to the farm business, angling club and tourism businesses specifically identified as benefitting during the application (0590/17), furthermore given the lack of sustainable access and impact on infrastructure it is considered that the proposal would have adverse impacts not outweighed by benefits, contrary to the NPPF.
25 SITE INSPECTION

25.1 None requested.

The business of the meeting was concluded at 12.44 pm.

........................................
Chair