

BABERGH DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** held in the Virtual Teams Video Meeting on Wednesday, 21 April 2021 - 09:30

PRESENT:

Councillor: Peter Beer (Chair)
Stephen Plumb (Vice-Chair)

Councillors: Sue Ayres
Siân Dawson
Leigh Jamieson
Adrian Osborne

David Busby
John Hinton
Mary McLaren
Lee Parker

Ward Member(s):

Councillors: John Ward

In attendance:

Officers: Area Planning Manager (MR)
Planning Lawyer (IDP)
Governance Officer (CP)
Planning Officer (JW/SS/SS)

Apologies:

Melanie Barrett
Alison Owen

57 SUBSTITUTES AND APOLOGIES

Apologies of absence were received from Councillor Melanie Barrett and Councillor Alison Owen.

Councillor Sian Dawson substituted for Councillor Melanie Barrett.

58 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

None declared.

59 PL/20/15 TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 7 APRIL 2021

It was resolved that the Minutes of the meeting held on 17 April 2021 were confirmed as a true record. The Minutes would be signed at the next practicable opportunity.

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

None received.

61 SITE INSPECTIONS

None requested.

62 PL/20/16 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/20/16 and the speakers responded to questions put to them as provided for under those arrangements.

Application Number	Representations from:
DC/20/04417	Andrew Renshaw (Objector) Shaun Davis (Supporter) Mitch Marginson (Applicant) Councillor John Ward (Ward Member)
DC/21/00110	None
DC/21/00813	Carol Schleip (Hadleigh Town Council)

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/20/16 be made as follows:-

63 DC/20/04417 LAND ADJACENT THE BREWERS ARMS, BOWER HOUSE TYE, POLSTEAD, COLCHESTER, SUFFOLK, CO6 5BZ

63.1 Item 6A

Application Proposal	DC/20/04417 Planning Application – Change of use of land for the erection of 6 dwellings and the siting of 5 holiday cabins including creation of car park and alterations to existing vehicular access
Site Location	POLSTEAD- Land adjacent, The Brewers Arms, Bower House Tye, Polstead, Colchester, Suffolk, CO6 5BZ
Applicant	Mr Marginson

- 63.2 The Case Officer presented the application to the Committee outlining the heritage harm, the access point, the landscape harm, the loss of amenity, the lack of affordable housing, and the Officer recommendation for refusal.
- 63.3 The Case Officer responded to Members' questions on issues including: the ownership of the site, the agricultural access, the access to the site, and the current 5-year land supply.
- 63.4 Members considered the representation from Andrew Renshaw who spoke as an Objector.
- 63.5 The Objector responded to Members' questions on issues such as opinion in the area.
- 63.6 Members considered the representation from Shaun Davis who spoke as a Supporter.
- 63.7 The Supporter responded to Members; questions on issues such as the viability of the public house, the local transport links, and the correlation between the holiday lets and the public house.
- 63.8 Members considered the representation from Mitch Marginson who spoke as the Applicant.
- 63.9 The Applicant responded to Members' questions on issues such as how the bungalows support the business, and if there was a legal agreement in place.
- 63.10 Members considered the representation from Councillor John Ward, Ward Member, who spoke on the application.
- 63.11 The Ward Member responded to Members' questions on issues such as: sustainability.
- 63.12 Members debated the application on issues including: the site being outside of the development boundary, the isolated location of the site, the over 55s bungalows, and the lack of benefit for the surrounding area.
- 63.13 Councillor Stephen Plumb proposed that the application be refused as detailed in the officer recommendation. Councillor Lee Parker seconded the proposal.
- 63.14 By a unanimous vote.

63.15 It was RESOLVED:-

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

- 1. The location of the proposed development is not considered to be sustainable because Bower House Tye has no facilities or amenities for local residents, other than the public house. There are no pedestrian footways with**

street lighting that would easily access facilities or amenities and therefore it is likely that future residents would be heavily reliant on the motor vehicle for everyday needs.

The proposed development, remote from local services, car dependent and offering very limited long term social and economic benefits, does not constitute sustainable development, contrary to Policies CS1, CS11 and CS15 of the Babergh Core Strategy (2014) and paragraphs 8 and 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

2. The morphology and uncharacteristic architecture of the proposal would not reflect the 'dispersed settlement pattern of loosely clustered villages, hamlets and isolated farmsteads' described in Suffolk County Council's landscape characterisation of Ancient Rolling Farmlands, which includes this area. The development's regimented and non-traditional approach to layout would not reflect the traditions of the area or reinforce local distinctiveness. It would not correspond with the historic linear development addressing the road – which includes Holmwood Cottages – or the more dispersed, semi-isolated nature of The Bower Close. These aspects of the scheme would all result in a degradation of the rural setting of the listed buildings and the historic settlement, and therefore a diminution of the positive contribution the undeveloped land makes to their significance. The proposal would cause a level of less than substantial harm to Holmwood Cottages and to The Bower Close. As such, the scheme does not accord with National and Local Planning Policies. Local Plan Policy CN06 states that proposals should 'be of an appropriate scale, form, siting and detailed design to harmonise with the existing building and its setting; retain a curtilage area and/or setting which is appropriate to the listed building and the relationship with its surroundings; respect those features which contribute positively to the setting of a listed building including space, views from and to the building and historic layout...' The less than substantial harm is not outweighed by the public benefits of this scheme. The proposal is contrary to Policy CN06 of the Babergh Local Plan 2006 and Policy CS15 of the Babergh Core Strategy 2014 which are consistent with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019, in particular paragraphs 8 and 196.

3. The new woodland planting will separate the proposal from the existing settlement creating an isolated development pocket outside the existing settlement cluster. The proposed layout does not reflect, or relate to, the existing local settlement pattern. The proposed development appears detached from the cluster to the north which is not in keeping with the existing settlement pattern. The proposal is considered to conflict with Policy CN01 of the Babergh Local Plan 2006 and Policies CS11 and CS15 of the Babergh Core Strategy 2014, which are consistent with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019, in particular paragraphs 8 and 170.

4. The proposed development raises potential issues of loss of residential amenity from activities and event at the public house, to future residents of the development. No noise assessment was received with the application and a full assessment of the potential for noise nuisance has been assessed. Restrictions of the activities of the public house

could reduce the viability of the business which would conflict with Policy CS15 of the Babergh Core Strategy 2014. A good level of amenity is an aim of paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

64 DC/21/00110 WARDENS OFFICE, SHELTERED HOUSING, STEEDS MEADOW, LONG MELFORD, SUDBURY, SUFFOLK

Item 6B

Application	DC/21/00110
Proposal	Planning Application – Change of use and conversion of guest room/office to form 1 additional sheltered housing flat.
Site Location	LONG MELFORD – Wardens Office, Sheltered Housing, Steeds Meadow, Long Melford, Sudbury, Suffolk
Applicant	Mid Suffolk District Council

64.1 The Case Officer presented the application to the Committee outlining the site location, the changes to the parking area, and the officer recommendation for approval.

64.2 The Case Officer responded to Members' questions on issues including: the applicant being the council, and whether any of the existing facilities would be removed.

64.3 Councillor Peter Beer proposed that the application be approved as detailed in the officer recommendation. Councillor Stephen Plumb seconded the proposal.

By a unanimous vote.

It was RESOLVED: -

That the application is GRANTED planning permission and includes the following conditions:

- **Standard time limit (3yrs for implementation of scheme/Outline/Reserved/Section73?)**
- **Approved Plans (Plans submitted that form this application)**
- **Removal of Permitted Development rights**
- **Provision of parking prior to occupation.**

65 DC/21/00813 HADLEIGH POOL AND LEISURE STONEHOUSE ROAD, HADLEIGH, IPSWICH, SUFFOLK, IP7 5BH

65.1 Item 6c

Application	DC/21/00813
Proposal	Application for consent to display an advertisement(s) – illuminated lettering and 5no. panel signs
Site Location	HADLEIGH – Hadleigh pool and leisure, Stonehouse Road, Hadleigh, Ipswich, Suffolk, IP7 5BH
Applicant	Babergh District Council

- 65.2 The Case Officer presented the application to the Committee outlining the proposed external lighting, and the conservation area surrounding the site.
- 65.3 The Case Officer responded to Members' questions on issues including: the lighting in the area, the conservation area, and the timing of the lighting.
- 65.4 Members considered the representation from Carol Schleip of Hadleigh Town Council.
- 65.5 Members debated the application on issues including: the source of the light, the pre-existing sign, the conservation area, and the material of the panels.
- 65.6 Councillor Lee Parker proposed that the application be approved as detailed in the officer recommendation. Councillor Stephen Plumb seconded the proposal.
- 65.7 By a unanimous vote

It was RESOLVED:-

That the advertisement consent application is GRANTED and include the following conditions:-

- **Development in accordance with approved plans**
- **No intermittent, flashing, or recurring form of lighting**
- **No advertisement shall be displayed without permission from the site owner**
- **No advertisement shall be displayed in a way which endangers public safety.**
- **All advertisements shall be maintained in a condition which ensures there is no visual impairment on the area**
- **Any advertisement and structure for their display shall be properly maintained to ensure there is no**
- **adverse impact on public safety.**
- **Where an advertisement is removed the site shall be left in a condition which does not endanger**
- **the public and does not impair visual amenity.**
- **The maximum level of illumination shall not exceed 250 candela/m².**

There advertisements shall only be illuminated between 05:45 to 22.30 Monday to Friday and 06:15- 20:30 Saturday and Sunday.

The business of the meeting was concluded at 11.38 am.

.....
Chair