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, 22 June 2022 at 09:30am.

PRESENT:

Councillor: Matthew Hicks (Chair)

Councillors: Rachel Eburne, John Field, John Matthissen, Timothy Passmore, Keith Welham

Ward Member(s):

Councillors: Terence Carter, Helen Geake, Dave Muller

In attendance:

Officers: Chief Planning Officer (PI)
Area Planning Manager (GW)
Planning Lawyer (IDP)
Case Officers (AG/JW/AS)
Governance Officer (CP)

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE/SUBSTITUTIONS

1.1 Apologies were received from Councillor Humphreys MBE, Councillor Mansel and Councillor Meyer.

1.2 Councillor Welham substituted for Councillor Mansel.

2 TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS AND OTHER REGISTRABLE OR NON-REGISTRABLE INTERESTS BY MEMBERS

2.1 Councillor Eburne declared a non-registerable interest in respect of application number DC/22/01615 as a relative works for the applicant, Bloor Homes Eastern.

3 DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING

3.1 All Members declared that they had been lobbied in respect of application numbers DC/22/01615 and DC/22/02252.

4 DECLARATIONS OF PERSONAL SITE VISITS

4.2 Councillor Eburne declared a personal site visit in respect of application number DC/22/02252.

5 NA/22/1 CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 04 MAY 2022

5.1 Councillor Matthissen commented that paragraphs 164.5 and 164.7 of the minutes should make specific reference to the concerns from Members over the gas grid.

5.2 It was agreed that the minutes would be amended to include ‘proposed heating systems especially regarding the gas grid’.

By a vote of 5 votes for and 1 abstention

It was RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 06 April 2022 were confirmed and signed as a true record.

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

6.1 None received.

7 NA/22/2 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

7.1 The Chair advised the Committee that there would be a change in the order of proceedings and the applications would be presented in the order as follows:

7C DC/22/02252
7A DC/22/01615
7B DC/21/04476

7.2 In accordance with the Councils procedures for public speaking at on planning applications, representations were made as follows:

Application Number	Representations From
DC/22/02252	Bob Cracknell (Objector) Jenny Davidson (Applicant) Councillor Dave Muller (Ward Member) Councillor Terence Carter (Ward Member)
DC/22/01615	Peter Dow (Elmswell Parish Council) Alex Clark (Applicant) Councillor Helen Geake (Ward Member)

	Councillor Sarah Mansel (Ward Member)
DC/21/04476	Paul Fox (Applicant) Councillor David Burn (Ward Member) Councillor Andrew Stringer (Ward Member)

8 DC/22/02252 WORK OF ART, GUN COTTON WAY, AND SOUTH OF LINNET DRIVE, STOWMARKET

8.1 Item 7C

Application	DC/22/02252
Proposal	Full Application – Erection of 2No art displays
Site Location	**STOWMARKET** – Work of Art Gun Cotton Way, and South of Linnet Drive, Stowmarket
Applicant	Cedars Park Art

8.2 The Case Officer presented the application to the Committee outlining the proposal before Members, the location of the site, the speed limits of the adjacent roads, the size and material of the proposed artwork and accompanying information board, the additional highways comments contained in the tabled papers and the officer recommendation of approval as detailed in the Committee report.

8.3 The Case Officer responded to questions from Members on issues including: the location of the information board and how pedestrians would be able to access the board.

8.4 Members considered the representation from Bob Cracknell who spoke as an objector.

8.5 Members considered the representation from Jenny Davidson who spoke as the applicant.

8.6 Members considered the representation from Councillor Muller who spoke as the Ward Member.

8.7 Members considered the representation from Councillor Carter who spoke as the Ward Member.

8.8 The Applicant responded to questions from Members on the proposed funding of future repair and maintenance works associated with the installation, and the location of the information board.

8.9 Members debated the application on issues including: safety concerns relating to the layout of the roundabout and adjacent roads, and the benefits

of displaying artworks in the local area.

8.10 Councillor Passmore proposed that the application be approved as detailed in the officer recommendation.

8.11 Councillor Eburne seconded the proposal.

8.12 Members continued to debate the application on issues including: the potential impact on visibility at the roundabout, and alternative locations for the artwork.

By a unanimous vote

It was RESOLVED:

That authority be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer to GRANT planning permission.

1) **That the Chief Planning Officer be authorised to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions as summarised below and those as may be deemed necessary by the Chief Planning Officer:**

   - **Standard time limit**
   - **Approved plans (Plan submitted that form this application)**

2) **And the following informative notes as summarised and those as may be deemed necessary:**

   - **Pro active working statement**
   - **Application for a street furniture license.**

9 DC/22/01615 LAND TO THE NORTH AND WEST OF, SCHOOL ROAD, ELMSWELL, SUFFOLK

9.1 Item 7A

Application	DC/22/01615
Proposal	Application for Approval of Reserved Matters following grant of Outline Approval DC/18/02146 Town and Country Planning Order 2015 - Submission of details for Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for erection of up to 86 dwellings (30No affordable units) including car parking, early years provision, open space provision with associated infrastructure and vehicular access. Highways improvements of road widening and cycle/footpath link.
Site Location	**ELMSWELL** – Land to the North and West of, School Road, Elmswell, Suffolk
Applicant	Bloor Homes Eastern

9.2 The Case Officer introduced the application to the Committee outlining the proposal before Members, the contents of the tabled papers, the location, layout and design of the site, access to the site, proposed parking and cycle storage plans, the proposed sustainability plan, and the officer recommendation of approval as detailed in the report and the tabled papers.

9.3 The Case Officer and the Chief Planning Officer responded to questions from Members on issues including: why the dwellings are being built to differing building regulations across the site, the proposed heating source, the number of triple parking spaces, the proposed location of the pre-school, the conversion of gas heating systems to hydrogen, the acoustic requirements for the pre-school, any plans for the future management of the public open spaces, whether the proposed amendments to the road layout raised by Place Services had been addressed, whether the driveways would be permeable, biodiversity matters, the location of the affordable dwellings and which building regulations they would be built to, the proposed landscaping adjacent to the railway line, and the cycle path and footway provision.

9.5 The Chief Planning Officer provided clarification to Members of the current position regarding the cycle path and footway provision including the location and funding, and the relevance of these issues to the application being presented to Members.

9.6 Members considered the representation from Peter Dow who spoke on behalf of Elmswell Parish Council.

9.7 The Parish Council representative and the Chief Planning Officer responded to questions from Members on issues including the location of the cycle path.

9.8 Members considered the representation from Alex Clarke who spoke as the Applicant.

9.9 The Applicant responded to questions from Members on issues including: whether the affordable homes would be built to the new building regulations, why the buildings are being built to differing building regulations across the site, the proposed heating systems and whether the Applicant would be prepared to increase the number of dwellings on site with alternative heating sources, whether additional landscaping could be included along the railway line, which properties would have solar panels installed, proposed sustainability measures, the number of triple parking spaces on site, and whether the roads would be to an adoptable standard.

9.10 A break was taken from 11:25am until 11:40am.

9.11 The Ward Member Councillor Geake read out a statement from Ward Member Councillor Mansel who was unable to attend the meeting.

9.12 Members considered the representation from Councillor Geake who spoke as

the Ward Member.

9.13 The Case Officer and the Chief Planning Officer responded to a question from Members regarding the conditions relating to the children's play area, whether an informative could be added to the permission to ensure that there are improvements made to the cycle path and footway, and the ownership of the land where the path is located.

9.14 Members debated the application on issues including: the location of the cycle path and the width of the adjacent road, which buildings regulations the dwellings would meet, and potential traffic issues.

9.15 Councillor Passmore proposed that the application be approved as detailed in the officer recommendation, and with the addition of informative notes relating to building regulations, the cycle path and footway, the permeability of driveways, and the play equipment.

9.16 Members continued to debate the application on issues including the cycle path and footway, and the varying building regulations being met across the site.

9.17 The Chief Planning Officer provided clarification to Members that the technical advice before the committee confirmed that the cycle and footpath scheme was considered to be acceptable by SCC Highways, and followed the outline planning permission and S106 agreement.

9.18 A break was taken from 12:16pm until 12:26pm to enable officers to discuss the proposed additional conditions and informatives with the applicant.

9.19 Councillor Passmore accepted the additional informatives and conditions regarding permeable surfaces, the play equipment and building regulations, as read out by the Chief Planning Officer.

9.20 Councillor Hicks seconded the proposal.

By a vote of 4 votes for a 2 against

It was RESOLVED

That authority be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer to approve the reserved matters subject to conditions including those below and as may be advised by consultees summarised below and such further conditions as may be deemed appropriate by the Chief Planning Officer:

- **Confirmation that the application is granted reserved matters approval and reminder that the conditions attached to outline DC/18/022146 still apply.**
- **Approved drawings and plans.**
- **Material palette to be approved with regards to roofing materials.**

- **Tree protection for existing trees and hedges to be in place as shown in submitted documents.**
- **Glazing details for dwellings affected by excess noise to be submitted, agreed and installed before the dwellings are first occupied.**
- **Additional archaeological investigation to be in place for the land to the west of School Road and for additional work to secure finds within the site.**
- **Details of play space, including equipment specification, location and timeline for delivery.**

And the following informative notes as summarised and those as may be deemed necessary:

- **Proactive working statement.**
- **SCC Highways notes.**
- **Support for sustainable development principles.**
- **Informatives identified by SCC LLFA.**

And the following additional conditions and informatives:

That the Chief Planning Officer be instructed to secure the applicants offer of PV on all plots where reasonably practicable by orientation under condition 21 to the OL PP

Informatives:

- **Secure permeable drainage as part of SuDS design where reasonably practicable to the satisfaction of the LPA in consultation with LLFA.**
- **Seek provision play equipment within the Open Space specification under the Section 106 in consultation with the Parish Council.**
- **Continue works for wider footway/cycleway link**

Note 'early years provision' removed from description of development, except with regards to layout

10 DC/21/04476 LAND, NORWICH ROAD, WETHERINGSETT CUM BROCKFORD, PART IN THE PARISH OF STOKE ASH AND THWAITE, SUFFOLK

10.1 Item 7B

Application DC/21/04476

Proposal	Application for Outline Planning Permission (Access to be considered) – Erection of 14 no. dwellings comprising: 5 no. two bedroom units; 7 no. three bedroom units; and 2 no. four bedroom units
Site Location	**WETHERINGSETT SUM BROCKFORD** – Land, Norwich Road, Wetheringsett Cum Brockford, Part in the Parish of Stoke Ash and Thwaite, Suffolk
Applicant	Pryde Homes Ltd

10.2 Councillor Eburne left the meeting at 12:35pm before the commencement of application number DC/21/04476.

10.3 The Case Officer presented the application to the Committee outlining the proposal before Members, the location and layout of the site, the previous extant planning permission granted in October 2020, the increased number of proposed dwellings at the site compared to the previous application, the content of the tabled papers, and the officer recommendation of approval as detailed in the committee report.

10.4 The Case Officer responded to questions from Members on issues including: whether officers were made aware when the previous permission was granted that there may be an increased number of dwellings at the site and how this increase would relate to the affordable housing requirement.

10.5 Members considered the representation from Chris Collins who spoke as the applicant.

10.6 The Case Officer and the Applicant responded to questions from Members on issues including the insufficient flood risk information.

10.7 The Chair read out statements from Ward Members Councillor Burn and Councillor Stringer who were unable to attend the meeting.

10.8 Councillor Field proposed that the application be refused as detailed in the officer recommendation.

10.9 Members debated the application on issues including: road safety concerns, sustainability and the layout of the site.

10.10 Councillor Passmore seconded the proposal.

10.11 Members continued to debate the application on issues including: the lack of drainage and flood risk information, and the increase in the proposed number of dwellings.

10.12 The Area Planning Manager provided details to Members on some minor amendments to the officer recommendation.

By a unanimous vote:

It was RESOLVED:

That the application be refused planning permission for the following reasons:

1. **REASON FOR REFUSAL - UNSUSTAINABLE LOCATION**

   The proposal is located in the countryside where the development of the new dwellings would not materially enhance or maintain the vitality of the rural community. Future occupants will, moreover, be likely to be reliant upon the private car to access services, facilities and employment. The District Council has an evidenced supply of land for housing in excess of 9years and has taken steps to boost significantly the supply of homes in sustainable locations. On this basis the proposal would not promote sustainable development and would be contrary to the adopted policies of the development plan which seek to direct the majority of new development to towns and key service centres listed in the Core Strategy 2008 with some provision to meet local needs in primary and secondary villages under policy CS1. In the countryside development is to be restricted having regard to policy CS2 and it is considered that in the circumstances of this application the direction of new housing development to more sustainable locations is of greater weight than the delivery of these additional dwellings in a less sustainable location. Having regard to the significant supply of land for homes in the District it is considered that the objectives of paragraph 60 of the NPPF are being secured and that on the considerations of this application the objective to boost significantly the supply of homes should be given reduced weight. Whilst the NPPF presumption in favour of sustainable development is applicable to the application it is considered that the development of this site would cause adverse impacts to the proper planning of the District having regard to the above-mentioned development plan objectives to secure planned development in more sustainable locations rather than piecemeal development in less sustainable locations which significantly and demonstrably outweigh the limited benefits of this development. As such the proposal is not acceptable in principle, being contrary to paragraphs 8 and 11 of the NPPF (2021), Policy H7 of the Mid Suffolk Local Plan (1998), Policies CS1 and CS2 of the Core Strategy (2008) and Policy FC1 and FC1.1 of the Core Strategy Focused Review (2012).

2. **REASON FOR REFUSAL - INSUFFICIENT FLOOD RISK INFORMATION PROVIDED**

   The applicant has not provided sufficient flood risk and surface water treatment and disposal information with the application, to the satisfaction of the Lead Local Flood Authority and Local Planning Authority. The current proposal, therefore, presents a flood risk contrary to the provisions of section 14 of the NPPF.

11 SITE INSPECTION

11.1 None received.

The business of the meeting was concluded at 1.03 pm.

……..
Chair