

BABERGH DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** held in the King Edmund Chamber, Endeavour House, 8 Russell Road, Ipswich on Wednesday, 27 April 2022 at 09:30am.

PRESENT:

Councillor: Stephen Plumb (Chair)

Councillors:	Peter Beer	David Busby
	John Hinton	Leigh Jamieson
	Alastair McCraw	Mary McLaren
	Adrian Osborne	Alison Owen

Ward Member(s):

Councillors: Clive Arthey

In attendance:

Officers: Chief Planning Officer (PI)
Area Planning Manager (MR)
Planning Lawyer (IDP)
Case Officer (JME)
Governance Officer (CP)

128 SUBSTITUTES AND APOLOGIES

128.1 Apologies were received from Councillor Sue Ayres and Councillor Margaret Maybury.

129 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

129.1 There were no declarations of interest declared.

130 PL/21/30 TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 30 MARCH 2022

It was RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 30 March 2022 were confirmed and signed as a true record.

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

131.1 None received.

132 SITE INSPECTIONS

132.1 The Case Officer presented Members with a request for a site visit regarding application number DC/20/03083, Erwarton Hall Farm Yard, The Street, Erwarton, providing Members with details of the proposal including: the location and layout of the site, and the reason for the site visit.

132.2 The Chief Planning Officer and the Case Officer responded to questions from Members on issues including: the reason for the site inspection request, any amendments to the application since the previous site inspection request, the proposed access to the site, and the layout of the site.

132.3 Members considered the representation from Councillor Davis who spoke as the Ward Member.

132.4 Members debated the site visit request on issues including: the heritage aspects of the site.

132.5 Councillor Owen proposed that a site visit be undertaken.

132.6 Councillor Beer seconded the proposal.

By a vote of 8 votes for and 1 against

It was RESOLVED:

That a site visit be undertaken in respect of application number DC/20/03083.

133 PL/21/31 PLANNING APPLICATIONS 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 the items in Paper PL/21/31 and the speakers responded to questions put to them as provided for under those arrangements.

Application Number	Representations From
DC/20/03116	Ian Levett (Cockfield Parish Council) Steven Hopkins (Objector) Alan Valentine (Applicant) Councillor Clive Arthey (Ward Member)

It was 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) decisions on the items referred to in

Paper PL/21/31 be made as follows:-

134 DC/20/03116 LAND TO THE EAST OF, SUDBURY ROAD, COCKFIELD, BURY ST EDMUNDS, SUFFOLK, IP30 0LN

134.1 Item 6A

Application Proposal	DC/20/03116 Planning Application – Erection of new workshop building with the existing access to the site from the A1141 upgraded.
Site Location	COCKFIELD – Land to the East of, Sudbury Road, Cockfield, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk, IP30 0LN
Applicant	Firstgrade Recycling Systems Limited

134.2 The Case Officer presented the application to the Committee outlining the proposal before Members including: the previous planning applications at the site, the location and layout of the site, proposed access to the site, the proposed drainage design and landscaping plans, and the officer recommendation of refusal as detailed in the tables papers.

134.3 The Case Officer and the Chief Planning Officer responded to questions from Members on issues including: the response received from Suffolk County Council Highways, the suitability of the location for a business, alternative sites in the area, the reasons for the change in recommendation since the application was previously presented to Committee, and the previous decision made by Committee and the outcomes of the subsequent judicial review.

134.4 Members considered the representation from Ian Levett who spoke on behalf of Cockfield Parish Council.

134.5 The Parish Council representative responded to questions from Members on issues including: any consultation between the Applicant and the Parish Council, and the hours of operation at the site.

134.6 The Area Planning Manager responded to questions from Members on issues including: the action which could be taken if planning conditions were breached at an application site.

134.7 Members considered the representation from Steven Hopkins who spoke on behalf of the Objector.

134.8 The Planning Lawyer and the Objector responded to questions from Members on issues including: the outcome of the judicial review of the application previously presented to Committee, and the application of Planning Policies.

134.9 Members considered the representation from Alan Valentine who spoke as the Applicant.

134.10 The Applicant responded to questions from Members on issues including: any alternative sites considered, the plans in place for the existing operating site, the reason for the lack of consultation with the Parish Council, whether any pre-application planning advice had been sought, the design and appearance of the properties, any proposed plans for highway improvements, the potential increase in the number of vehicle movements at the site, the operating hours of the site, and the planned timescale for works to commence should planning permission be approved.

134.11 A break was taken from 10:55am until 11:14am.

134.12 Members considered the representation from Councillor Arthey who spoke as the Ward Member.

134.13 The Ward Member responded to questions from Members on issues including: how long the location had been in employment or industrial use.

134.14 The Case Officer provided clarification to Members regarding the location of the machinery storage area and the red line plan shown in the presentation.

134.15 The Case Officer responded to questions from Members on issues including: whether the location shown would be considered as agricultural land or open countryside.

134.16 Members debated the application on issues including: the principle of development, the need to support economic growth and productivity, the application of the policies within the National Planning Policy Framework,

134.17 The Chief Planning Officer provided clarification to Members regarding the application of the policies within the Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

134.18 Members continued to debate the application on issues including: the location of the site, and the suitability of the land for employment use.

134.19 Councillor McCraw proposed that the application be refused as detailed in the Officer recommendation contained in the tabled papers.

134.20 Councillor Owen seconded the proposal.

By a vote of 6 votes for, 2 against and 1 abstention.

It was RESOLVED:

That the application is REFUSED planning permission/ for the following reasons: -

The proposed employment site is unsustainably located in the countryside, outside of any Built-Up Area Boundary and outside of any allocated site for

such a use, where development such as this would not normally be approved.

At its closest point, the built-up area boundary of Cross Green is approximately 400 metres from the site, separated by agricultural fields and the ponds and moat of Cross Green Farm. There are no pedestrian or cycle routes from the site into Cross Green. Moreover, the A1141 that links the site and Cross Green is a national speed limit road that lacks any lighting. Additionally, the site's relationship with the other settlements of Cockfield is further removed, at 4.6km to Great Green, 1.8km to Windsor Green and 3km to Crowbrook. For these reasons, the site is not adjacent to or well related to the existing patterns of development for any hinterland village or core village. There is no proven local need within the proposal that is associated with Cross Green or the other settlements that make up Cockfield and any additional employment opportunities are minimal and delayed.

The proposal is, therefore, contrary to policies CS2, CS11 and CS15 and no satisfactory justification, even within the context of adopted employment policies, has been provided to depart from these policies.

The business of the meeting was concluded at 11.42 am.

.....
Chair