

## MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE A** held in the Virtual Teams Video Meeting on Wednesday, 14 April 2021- 09:30

### **PRESENT:**

Councillor: Matthew Hicks (Chair)  
David Muller BA (Open) MCMI RAFA (Councillor) (Vice-Chair)

Councillors: Rachel Eburne John Field  
Sarah Mansel John Matthissen  
Richard Meyer Timothy Passmore

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

Councillors: Harry Richardson  
Wendy Turner  
James Caston

### **In attendance:**

Officers: Planning Lawyer (IDP)  
Area Planning Manager (JPG)  
Governance Officer (RC)  
Planning Officer (AS/SS)

A one-minute silence was held before the meeting in remembrance of His Royal Highness, Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh.

### **69 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE/SUBSTITUTIONS**

None received.

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

Councillor Sarah Mansel declared a Local Non-Pecuniary interest in application DC/21/00662 as discussions of development on the Hawes lane site started when she was Ward Member for the area.

Councillor John Field declared a Local Non-Pecuniary interest as the County Councillor for the area in which application DC/20/05586 is located.

### **71 DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING**

Councillors Mansel and Muller declared that they had been lobbied on application DC/21/00662.

Councillors Hicks, Mansel, Muller, Field and Eburne declared that they had been lobbied on application DC/20/05586

**72 DECLARATIONS OF PERSONAL SITE VISITS**

Councillors Mansel and Meyer declared personal site visits in respect of application number DC/21/00662.

**73 NA/20/13 CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 17 MARCH 2021**

It was Resolved that the minutes of the meeting held on 17 March 2021 were confirmed as a true record and would be signed at the next practicable opportunity.

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

None received.

**75 NA/20/14 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

In accordance with the Council's procedure for public speaking on planning applications, representations were made as detailed below.

Application Number	Representations from:
DC/21/00662	David Etchells-Butler (Norton Parish Council) Andrew Sedgewick (Objector) Steve Bean (Supporter) Philip Cobbold (Agent) Cllr Wendy Turner (Ward Member) Cllr Harry Richardson (Ward Member)
DC/20/05586	Caroline Wolton (Bramford Parish Council) Albert Horn (Objector) Lauren Parsons (Agent) Cllr James Caston (Ward Member)

**76 DC/21/00662 LAND OFF HAWES LANE, NORTON, BURY ST EDMUNDS, IP31 3LS**

**76.1 Item 7A**

Application DC/21/00662  
Proposal Outline Planning Application (access to be considered) – erection of 9.no dwellings and construction of vehicular access and pedestrian links ( re-submission of DC/20/04429).  
Site Location **NORTON** - Land off Hawes Lane, Norton, Bury St Edmunds, IP31 3LS  
Applicant Ash Property Consortium Ltd

- 76.2 The Case Officer presented the application to the Committee outlining the proposal before Members including: the site layout, the proposed increase to the road width, the proposed addition of passing bays, the pedestrian links to the existing bridleway, the proposed access, and the officer recommendation of approval.
- 76.3 The Case Officer responded to Member's questions on issues including: the increased road width, the capacity of facilities in Norton and the visibility splays of the footpath.
- 76.4 Members considered the representation from the Parish Council representative David Etchells-Butler.
- 76.5 The Parish Council Representative responded to Members' questions on issues including: the use of the main road, whether a housing needs survey had been conducted, the location of the facilities in Norton, and the current number of houses in Norton.
- 76.6 Members considered the representation from the Objector Andrew Sedgewick.
- 76.7 The Objector responded to Members' questions on issues such as: the pedestrian links, sewage and water issues, and the impact on the highways network.
- 76.8 Members considered the representation from the Supporter Steve Bean.
- 76.9 Members considered the representation from the Agent Philip Cobbold.
- 76.10 The Agent responded to Members' questions on issues such as: the mix of housing, the footpath and access, and whether the site was in the emerging Joint Local Plan.
- 76.11 Members considered the representation from Ward Members Councillor Wendy Turner and Councillor Harry Richardson, who spoke against the application.
- 76.12 The Ward Members responded to Members' questions on issues including: the local transport links and the current use of the lane.
- 76.13 Members debated the application on issues including: the urbanisation of a rural area, the sewage system, the traffic along the A1088, the traffic impact on the country lane and the impact the development would have on the character in the village.
- 76.14 Councillor John Field Proposed that the application be refused for the reasons as detailed below:
1. Notwithstanding the highways improvements proposed, the proposed

development accessing Hawes lane would, if approved, likely result in a significant conflict between cars and pedestrians by construction traffic and during the lifetime of the development and given the design and character of the lane would be detrimental to highway safety and amenity for existing and future residents.

Furthermore, wear and tear as well as the highways improvements proposed would be visually detrimental to the character of the rural lane due to increased traffic including cars and larger vehicles and urbanisation of the lane.

On this basis it is contrary to Policies T10, GP1 and H16 of the Local Plan, FC1.1 of the Focus Review and NPPF including section 12, and Paras 108 and 110.

76.15 Councillor Richard Meyer seconded the motion.

76.16 By 7 votes to 1

76.17 It was **RESOLVED:**

**That the application be refused for the following reasons:**

**1. Notwithstanding the highways improvements proposed, the proposed development accessing Hawes lane would, if approved, likely result in a significant conflict between cars and pedestrians by construction traffic and during the lifetime of the development and given the design and character of the lane would be detrimental to highway safety and amenity for existing and future residents.**

**Furthermore, wear and tear as well as the highways improvements proposed would be visually detrimental to the character of the rural lane due to increased traffic including cars and larger vehicles and urbanisation of the lane.**

**On this basis it is contrary to Policies T10, GP1 and H16 of the Local Plan, FC1.1 of the Focus Review and NPPF including section 12, and Paras 108 and 110.**

**77 DC/20/05586 COCK INN, THE STREET, BRAMFORD, IPSWICH, SUFFOLK, IP8 4DU**

77.1 Item 7B

Application Proposal	DC/20/05586 Full Planning Application – Erection of 1 single storey dwelling (C3) to the rear of the public house (Sui Generis), with associated access, parking and landscaping (amended scheme to DC/20/02269).
Site Location	<b>BRAMFORD</b> – Cock Inn, The Street, Bramford, Ipswich, Suffolk, IP8 4DU
Applicant	Punch Partnerships (PML) Limited.

77.2 A short comfort break was taken between 11:38-11:51 after the completion of DC/21/00662 but before the commencement of DC/20/05586.

77.3 The Case Officer presented the application to the Committee outlining the proposal before Members including: the reduction in car parking for the pub, the private amenity spaces, the proposed measures to reduce the noise impact, the heritage and highways changes from the previous application, the landscaping plans, and the officer recommendation of approval.

77.4 The Case Officer responded to Member's questions on issues including: the potential parking conflicts, the response from the Council's Environmental Health Team, access to the beer garden from the car park, noise survey, and highways assessment.

77.5 The Parish Council representative Caroline Wolton spoke against the application.

77.6 The Parish Council representative responded to Members' questions on issues including: the asset of community value.

77.7 Members considered the representation from the Objector Albert Horn.

77.8 The Objector responded to Members' questions on issues such as: noise issues within the village.

77.9 Members considered the representation from the Agent Lauren Parsons.

77.10 The Agent responded to Members' questions on issues including: t measures to minimise disturbance for future occupants of the dwelling, and parking conflicts.

77.11 Members considered the representation from Councillor James Caston who spoke against the application.

77.12 The Ward Member responded to Members' questions on issues including: how the general ambience of the pub would be compromised.

77.13 Members debated the application on issues including: the asset of community value, noise generated from the pub and outside ambience, the viability of the pub, and pedestrian access to the dwelling.

77.14 Councillor Timothy Passmore proposed that the application be refused for the following reasons:

1. The sub-division and loss of part of the beer garden, that is an asset of community value, would likely impact the financial viability and function of the public house by reducing the outdoor dining/drinking area and thereby limiting the number of customers that the public house could serve. This would be detrimental to its valued contribution to the community and local employment. In addition, the development

would further enclose the public house leading to potential increased concerns of concentrated noise and disturbance in a decreased beer garden area acting as an unnecessary form of significant restraint on the current business operation and viability. It is considered that the benefits of a single dwelling would not outweigh these material issues. On this basis the proposal is contrary to Policies E6, H17 and the aims of Paragraphs 8, 80 and 92 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

2. The development would result in an unsafe pedestrian and vehicle access arrangement, create an inappropriate residential/commercial interface and the proposed development would result in an intensification of use of a substandard access failing demonstrate appropriate visibility splays can be achieved and is considered that there is a significant risk to highway safety contrary to policy T10 and paragraphs 108 and 109 of the NPPF.

77.15 Councillor Sarah Mansel Seconded the motion.

77.16 By a unanimous vote

77.17 It was **RESOLVED:**

**That the application be refused for the following reasons:**

**1. The sub-division and loss of part of the beer garden, that is an asset of community value, would likely impact the financial viability and function of the public house by reducing the outdoor dining/drinking area and thereby limiting the number of customers that the public house could serve. This would be detrimental to its valued contribution to the community and local employment. In addition, the development would further enclose the public house leading to potential increased concerns of concentrated noise and disturbance in a decreased beer garden area acting as an unnecessary form of significant restraint on the current business operation and viability. It is considered that the benefits of a single dwelling would not outweigh these material issues. On this basis the proposal is contrary to Policies E6, H17 and the aims of Paragraphs 8, 80 and 92 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.**

**2. The development would result in an unsafe pedestrian and vehicle access arrangement, create an inappropriate residential/commercial interface and the proposed development would result in an intensification of use of a substandard access failing demonstrate appropriate visibility splays can be achieved and is considered that there is a significant risk to highway safety contrary to policy T10 and paragraphs 108 and 109 of the NPPF.**

## **78 SITE INSPECTION**

78.1 None requested.

The business of the meeting was concluded at 1.15 pm.

.....  
Chair