

## **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, 9 February 2022 at 09:30am.

### **PRESENT:**

Councillor: Matthew Hicks (Chair)

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

### **In attendance:**

Officers: Chief Planning Officer (PI)  
Planning Lawyer (IDP)  
Case Officers (DC/SB/VP)  
Governance Officer (CP)

### **119 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE/SUBSTITUTIONS**

119.1 Apologies were received from Councillor Barry Humphreys MBE.

119.2 Councillor James Caston substituted for Councillor Humphreys MBE.

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

120.1 Councillor Caston declared a local non-pecuniary interest in respect of application number DC/21/05587.

### **121 DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING**

121.1 All Members of the Committee declared that they had been lobbied in respect of application number DC/21/03292.

### **122 DECLARATIONS OF PERSONAL SITE VISITS**

122.1 None declared.

### **123 NA/21/20 CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 08 DECEMBER 2021**

**It was RESOLVED:**

**That the minutes of the meeting held on 08 December 2021 were confirmed and signed as a true record.**

**124 NA/21/21 CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 12 JANUARY 2022**

124.1 Councillor Eburne commented that the details of the meeting attendees were missing from the minutes.

124.2 The Governance Officer confirmed this would be corrected and the minutes would be brought back to the next available meeting.

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

125.1 None received.

**126 NA/21/22 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

126.1 The Chair advised that application numbers DC/21/05063 and DC/20/04296 had been deferred and would not be considered at the meeting.

126.2 In accordance with the Council's procedures for public speaking on Planning applications, representations were made as detailed below:

Application Number	Representations From
DC/21/00609	Andy Robinson and Richard Berry (Eye Town Council) Robert Barber (Agent) Councillor Peter Gould (Ward Member)
DC/20/04067	Richard Berry (Eye Town Council)
DC/21/05063	Item deferred
DC/20/04296	Item deferred
DC/21/03292	Sav Patel (Agent) Councillor Andrew Mellen (Ward Member)
DC/20/05587	David Payne (Great Bricett Parish Council) Christopher Payne (Objector) Richard Boother (Agent) Councillor Daniel Pratt (Ward Member)

**127 DC/21/00609 LAND TO THE SOUTH OF EYE AIRFIELD, AND NORTH OF CASTLETON WAY, EYE**

127.1 Item 8A

Application	DC/21/00609
Proposal	Submission of details (Reserved Matters in Part-Phase 1)

	for Outline Planning Permission 3563/15 - Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for 138 dwellings, including affordable housing, car parking, open space provision and associated infrastructure.
Site Location	<b>EYE</b> – Land to the South of Eye Airfield, and North of Castleton Way, Eye
Applicant	Persimmon Homes Suffolk

- 127.2 The Case Officer presented the application to the Committee outlining the proposal before Members including: the location and layout of the site, access to the site, the proposed parking and landscaping plans, housing design, sustainability measures, the conditions applied to the application, and the officer recommendation of approval.
- 127.3 The Case Officer and the Chief Planning Officer responded to questions from Members on issues including: the housing mix, the proposed surface material of the driveways, landscaping and maintenance plans, whether the houses meet size standards, locations of emergency access and cycle routes, proposed garden sizes, the housing mix in comparison to the Eye Neighbourhood Plan, whether the electrical supply would be adequate to meet future requirements, whether future building regulations would be met, parking plans and Electric Vehicle charging points.
- 127.4 Members considered the representation from Andy Robinson and Richard Berry who spoke on behalf of Eye Town Council.
- 127.5 The Town Council representatives responded to questions from Members on issues including: what further ecological proposals the Town Council would like to be considered, the proposed design of the dwellings, parking issues, open space provision, whether the Town Council had a system in place to ensure landscaping and ecology requirements were put in place, and the cycle and pedestrian connectivity to the Town.
- 127.6 Members considered the representation from Robert Barber who spoke as the agent.
- 127.7 The Agent and the Applicant, Stuart McAdam, responded to questions from Members on issues including: cycle, pedestrian and emergency vehicle access, the number of houses expected to be completed before June 2022, the installation of gas boilers and any plans for alternative heating sources once the buildings regulations change, the comments from Suffolk Wildlife Trust, and the permeability of driveways.
- 127.8 The Case Officer responded to questions from Members regarding conditions relating to the installation of heating systems.
- 127.9 The Agent and the Applicant responded to further questions from Members on issues including: the housing mix, the proposed plans for the existing pond and surrounding trees, whether the spine roads would be to an adoptable

standard and offered to Suffolk County Council for adoption, and whether the properties would be built to comply with building regulations at the time of planning, or at the time of construction.

127.10 The Chair read out a statement from the Ward Member, Councillor Gould, who was unable to attend the meeting.

127.11 A break was taken from 11:14am until 11:23am.

127.12 Councillor Passmore proposed that the application be approved with additional conditions relating to issues including: design of the properties, and the permeability of driveways.

127.13 Members debated the application on issues including: the Eye Neighbourhood Plan, the timescales for the proposed landscaping plans, heating systems, the housing mix, pedestrian access routes, and sustainability issues.

127.14 Councillor Caston seconded the proposal.

127.15 Members continued to debate the application on issues including: the heating systems, ecology measures, and early landscaping.

127.16 The proposer and seconder accepted the following additional conditions and informative notes:

Conditions:

- Scheme of ecological "on plot" enhancements to include the installation of swift and house martin nest boxes/cups and hedgehog permeable boundaries TBA
- Scheme of permeable driveways and hard surfacing across the site TBA
- Scheme of landscape and ecological mitigation and enhancement timetabling across the site TBA which shall in particular require the planting of the boundaries of the site not later than the commencement of construction
- Scheme to safeguard the existing water features across the site TBA.

Informative Notes:

- The Committee note that the Eye NDP expects a housing mix set out in Policy EYE3 which is not yet demonstrated to have been met with this Reserved Matters application for this Phase. The Committee will expect further phases of this development to demonstrate that those further phases accord with that development plan policy so that the overall mix across the Outline permitted site accords with the development plan including the requirements of EYE3 of the Neighbourhood Development Plan

127.17 Members continued to debate the application on issues including: the provision of Electric Vehicle charging points.

By a vote of 5 votes for and 3 against

**It was RESOLVED:**

That authority be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer to grant the reserved matters application subject to the following conditions and informatives as recommended:

Conditions

- Reserved matters granted pursuant to 3563/15. Conditions attached to 3563/15 remain in force.
- Development to be brought forward in accordance with approved plans and documents.
- Garages to be retained as parking.
- Bicycle parking to be provided prior to occupation.
- Electric vehicle ducting to be provided prior to occupation.

Informatives

- Reminder that both the outline and reserved matters decisions form the planning permission for this site and that both continue to apply.
- Confirmation on any conditions discharged as part of this application.
- Informatives recommended by Anglian Water.
- Informative on discovery of unexpected contamination during development
- Informative on public rights of way.

For the avoidance of doubt, the conditions attached to the outline planning permission already granted remain in place, they secure the following:

- Soft landscaping scheme;
- Control of emergency access points;
- Site levels (both existing and proposed);
- Boundary treatments for individual properties;
- Design of the care home be limited to two storeys;
- Ecological mitigation;
- Restriction on use of piling;
- Implementation of the soft landscaping scheme;
- Energy and renewables strategy in accordance with policy CS3 to be submitted and agreed;
- Details of illumination within the site;
- Archaeological investigation of the site;
- Submission of post investigation report;
- Waste minimisation and recycling strategy to be submitted and agreed;
- Tree protection for retained trees and hedgerows;
- Landscape management plan to be submitted and agreed;
- Provision of fire hydrants within site;

- Construction management plan to be submitted and agreed;
- Land contamination process to be followed;
- Delivery of access on Castleton Way;
- Delivery of zebra crossing and school drop off area;
- Delivery of internal carriageways and footways;
- HGV deliveries to accord with delivery management plan which is to be submitted and agreed;
- Delivery of access to Langton Grove.

Given these will remain in force, there is no requirement to reimpose these conditions on this reserved matters application.

And the following additional conditions and informative notes put forward in the motion:

Conditions:

- Scheme of ecological "on plot" enhancements to include the installation of swift and house martin nest boxes/cups and hedgehog permeable boundaries TBA
- Scheme of permeable driveways and hard surfacing across the site TBA
- Scheme of landscape and ecological mitigation and enhancement timetabling across the site TBA which shall in particular require the planting of the boundaries of the site not later than the commencement of construction
- Scheme to safeguard the existing water features across the site TBA.

Informative Notes:

- The Committee note that the Eye NDP expects a housing mix set out in Policy EYE3 which is not yet demonstrated to have been met with this Reserved Matters application for this Phase. The Committee will expect further phases of this development to demonstrate that those further phases accord with that development plan policy so that the overall mix across the Outline permitted site accords with the development plan including the requirements of EYE3 of the Neighbourhood Development Plan.

## 128 DC/20/04067 LAND AT EYE AIRFIELD, CASTLETON WAY, EYE, SUFFOLK

### 128.1 Item 8B

Application Proposal	DC/20/04067 Submission of details (Reserved Matters in Part) for Outline Planning Permission 3563/15 - Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for Erection of 15 dwellings
Site Location Applicant	<b>EYE</b> – Land at Eye Airfield, Castleton Way, Eye, Suffolk Ryden Developments Ltd

- 128.2 The Case Officer presented the application to the Committee outlining the proposal before Members including: the location and layout of the site, the proposed parking plans, the sustainability statement, the design of the houses, proposed landscaping plans, provision of Electric Vehicle charging points, the proposed pedestrian and cycle routes, and the officer recommendation of approval.
- 128.3 The Case Officer responded to questions from Members on issues including: the proposed heating systems, whether there is any triple parking on site, the location of the care home and access road, landscaping issues, whether the roads would be to an adoptable standard, the installation of solar panels, the pedestrian access and any direct link to the existing public right of way network, and the visibility splays.
- 128.4 Members considered the representation from Richard Berry who spoke on behalf of Eye Town Council.
- 128.5 Members debated the application on issues including: landscaping, the design and layout of the proposal, the master plan for the development, and the conditions of the outline planning application.
- 128.6 Councillor Passmore proposed that the application be approved with additional conditions relating to loss of amenity for homes in Bothy Close, landscaping, and ecology.
- 128.7 Councillor Matthissen seconded the proposal and suggested further conditions relating to the pond, and the provision of M4(2) compliant properties.
- 128.8 Members continued to debate the application on issues including: the installation of solar panels.
- 128.8 The following additional conditions were accepted by the proposer and seconder:
- Requirement for the agreement of the revision of the master plan in relation to the future development of the care home
  - Scheme of landscaping and ecological mitigation and enhancement timetabling across the site TBA which shall in particular require the planting of the boundaries of the site not later than the commencement of construction.
  - Scheme of ecological "on plot" enhancements to include the installation of swift and house martin nest boxes/cups, hedgehog permeable boundaries and aquatic enhancements TBA
  - 50% of the bungalows shall be to M4(2) standard to ensure that the development is accessible and adaptable for all persons.

By a unanimous vote

**It was RESOLVED:**

**That authority be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer to grant the reserved matters application subject to the following conditions and informatives as recommended:**

**Conditions:**

- **Reserved matters granted pursuant to 3563/15. Conditions attached to 3563/15 remain in force.**
- **Development to be brought forward in accordance with approved plans and documents.**
- **Details of proposed cycle/pedestrian link to land adjacent to the south**

**Informatives:**

- **Reminder that both the outline and reserved matters decisions form the planning permission for this site and that both continue to apply.**
- **Confirmation on any conditions discharged as part of this application.**

**And the following additional conditions put forward in the motion:**

- **Requirement for the agreement of the revision of the master plan in relation to the future development of the care home**
- **Scheme of landscaping and ecological mitigation and enhancement timetabling across the site TBA which shall in particular require the planting of the boundaries of the site not later than the commencement of construction.**
- **Scheme of ecological "on plot" enhancements to include the installation of swift and house martin nest boxes/cups, hedgehog permeable boundaries and aquatic enhancements TBA**
- **50% of the bungalows shall be to M4(2) standard to ensure that the development is accessible and adaptable for all persons.**

**129 DC/21/05063 LAND SOUTH OF, FOREST ROAD, ONEHOUSE, IP14 3HQ**

**129.1 Item 8C**

Application Proposal	DC/21/05063 Application for Outline Planning Permission (some matters reserved, access, layout and scale to be considered) Town and Country Planning Act 1990 - Erection of 20No houses/bungalows (including 7 affordable) open space; sustainable urban drainage systems; and associated infrastructure.
Site Location	<b>ONEHOUSE</b> – Land South of, Forest Road, Onehouse, IP14 3HQ

Applicant

Harris Strategic Land

129.2 This application was deferred in order to seek landscape and heritage advice.

**130 DC/20/04296 STONHAM BARNs, PETTAUGH ROAD, STONHAM ASPAL, STOWMARRKET, SUFFOLK, IP14 6AT**

130.1 Item 8D

Application	DC/20/04296
Proposal	Planning Application - Use of land for the stationing of 18 holiday lodges
Site Location	<b>STONHAM ASPAL</b> – Stonham Barns, Pettaugh Road, Stonham Aspal, Stowmarket, Suffolk, IP14 6AT
Applicant	Stonham Barns Ltd

130.2 This application was deferred in order to review the report and recommendation.

**131 DC/21/03292 SOUTH OF BIRCH AVENUE, BACTON**

131.1 Item 8E

Application	DC/21/03292
Proposal	Planning Application - Erection of 85no dwellings (including 30no Affordable Housing dwellings) including vehicular access from Birch Avenue, open space provision, community facility provision, soft landscaping, biodiversity enhancements, SuDS and parking provision
Site Location	BACTON – South of Birch Avenue, Bacton
Applicant	Bellway Homes

131.2 A break was taken from 12:45pm until 13:19pm, after application number DC/20/04067 and before the commencement of application number DC/21/03292.

131.3 The Chief Planning Officer advised Members that the presentation contained a revised recommendation.

131.4 The Case Officer presented the application to the Committee outlining the proposal before Members including: the update from Network Rail, connectivity and access routes relating to the railway crossing, the location and layout of the application, and the revised recommendation of approval.

131.5 The Chief Planning Officer provided further details of the recommendations from Network Rail.

- 131.6 The Chief Planning Officer and the Case Officer responded to questions from Members on issues including: whether a timetable had been agreed for completion of the mitigation works, and the options for mitigation works.
- 131.7 Members considered the representation from Sav Patel who spoke as the agent.
- 131.8 The Chief Planning Officer responded to questions from Members on issues including: who would be responsible for the details of the scheme.
- 131.9 The Agent and the Chief Planning Officer responded to questions from Members on issues including: confirmation that Bellway Homes would be constructing a safety gate and fence, the ownership of the land on each side of the railway, who would be responsible for the funding of the safety mitigations, the options available for the safety scheme, and whether the proposal put forward by Bellway Homes included a link to Network Rails signalling system.
- 131.10 The Chair read out a statement from the Ward Member, Councillor Andrew Mellen, who was unable to attend the meeting.
- 131.11 The Chief Planning Officer provided clarification to Members of the revised officer recommendation.
- 131.12 Members debated the application on issues including: whether a condition could be included to ensure protection is provided for both directions, the anticipated level of foot traffic using the railway crossing, the, and the timescales for the mitigation works to be completed.
- 131.13 Councillor Passmore proposed that the application be approved as detailed in the revised recommendation presented to Members.
- 131.14 Councillor Eburne seconded the proposal.

By a vote of 7 votes for and 1 abstention

**It was RESOLVED:**

**That authority be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer that**

**[a] Subject to the prior agreement of a Section 106 Planning Obligation on appropriate terms to the satisfaction of the Chief Planning Officer as summarised below and those as may be deemed necessary by the Chief Planning Officer to secure:**

- **Affordable housing**
- **On site open space provision and specification (including LEAP), delivery and management in perpetuity**
- **Community centre land**
- **Education**

- Appropriate railway crossing mitigation scheme and timetable for its delivery

and

[b] subject thereto to grant full planning permission subject to the following conditions and those as may be deemed necessary by the Chief Planning Officer:

- Time limit
- Approved plans
- Phasing
- Access layout
- Bin storage and presentation as approved plans
- Estate roads and footpaths
- Provision of footways
- Parking and turning areas as approved plans
- Cycle storage and EV charging details to be agreed
- Visibility splays
- Residents travel pack to be agreed and provided
- Sound attenuation measures
- Construction management plan
- No burning on site
- Dust control scheme
- Carry out in accordance with arboricultural report
- Delivery of landscaping
- Fire hydrants
- Sustainability and energy scheme to be agreed
- Archaeology
- Skylark mitigation
- CEMP
- Biodiversity enhancement
- Wildlife sensitive lighting
- Implementation of SuDS in accordance with details submitted
- Cycle Link to Pretymen Avenue
- Notwithstanding details received, plans for the northern landscape buffer to achieve 5 metres depth unless otherwise agreed shall be agreed by the LPA, including detailed access arrangements and thereafter these details shall be retained on to be agreed and its management
- One bungalow to achieve M4(3) building regs secured for one unit.

**132 DC/20/05587 GREAT BRICETT BUSINESS PARK, THE STREET, GREAT BRICETT, SUFFOLK, IP7 7DZ**

132.1 Item 8F

Application	DC/20/05587
Proposal	Revised Planning Application - Change of use of land for the siting of 69 mobile homes (following demolition of

Site Location	existing buildings) and associated facilities <b>GREAT BRICETT</b> – Great Bricett Business Park, The Street, Great Bricett, Suffolk, IP7 7DZ
Applicant	Birch's Park Homes

- 132.2 The Case Officer presented the application to the Committee outlining the proposal before Members including: the amendments made to the proposal since the application was deferred in May 2021, the additional consultee responses received, the location and layout of the site, public transport links to the site, the housing mix, proposed parking and landscaping plans, heating systems, and the recommendation of refusal.
- 132.3 The Case Officer responded to questions from Members on issues including: the housing mix, the type of affordable housing accepted by the Strategic Housing Team, the existing use of the site, and whether the proposed type of dwelling counts towards the Authorities housing land supply numbers.
- 132.4 Members considered the representation from David Payne who spoke on behalf of Great Bricett Parish Council.
- 132.5 The Parish Council representative responded to questions from Members on issues including: the number of dwellings located in the village of Great Bricett.
- 132.6 Members considered the representation from Christopher Payne who spoke as an objector.
- 132.7 Members considered the representation from Richard Boother who spoke as the Agent.
- 132.8 The Case Officer responded to questions from Members on whether the 69 proposed homes would contribute to the housing land supply.
- 132.9 The Chair read out a statement from the Ward Member, Councillor Daniel Pratt, who was unable to attend the meeting.
- 132.10 Members debated the proposal on issues including: the location and type of housing and whether it met the needs of the local community.
- 132.11 Councillor Eburne proposed that the application be refused as detailed in the officer recommendation.
- 132.12 Councillor Matthissen seconded the proposal.
- 132.13 Members continued to debate the application on issues including: the housing mix,

By a unanimous vote

**It was RESOLVED:**

**(1)The application be REFUSED for the following reasons:**

**While the Council accepts that the proposed 69 park homes may add to consumer choice in respect of the type of new residential accommodation available for purchase in the District, they do not appropriately address the need for affordable housing across the District in a way that meets Adopted Local Plan Policy H4 and Draft Joint Local Plan Policy SP02.**

**The Council through the above policies and its Objectively Assessed Housing Needs Assessment expects residential developments of this scale to include a 35% component of on-site affordable housing comprising predominantly affordable rented accommodation with some affordable shared ownership. 35% of 69 is an affordable housing content of 17.8 dwellings.**

**In determining this application the Council has had regard to the applicant's offer contained in a signed unilateral undertaking to provide a financial contribution of £168,00 and latterly increased to 200,000 outside that Unilateral Undertaking towards off-site delivery of such affordable housing by the Council but finds it does not adequately outweigh the harm that will result from a short fall of some 15 such dwellings with a policy compliant solution.**

**The Council having approved outline planning permission for a 51 dwelling development comprising 35% affordable housing by way of S106 Agreement] under reference DC/17/03568 on 7 January 2019 reasonably expects 35% affordable housing delivery on this site. The fact that a valid reserved matters submission for that 51 dwelling development was received by the Council in December 2021 indicates that it is reasonable for the Council to reject the park home proposal on the ground that fails to make adequate provision for the delivery of affordable dwellings. The Reserved Matters application represents a choate alternative that accords with Adopted Council Policy. Its delivery will be prejudiced by permission for a park home development**

**It is the Council's opinion that being able to demonstrate that it has a 5-year housing land supply that does not rely on the inclusion of park home sites it is not imperative to approve this application in order to meet a deficiency in housing supply/delivery within the District. No overriding case for the need for park homes within the District in general and this site in particular has been provided and therefore the Council is of the opinion that there is no overriding justification to support this departure from Adopted policy.**

**If the extant planning permission has no realistic prospect of being delivered (and if the current proposal is assessed purely on its own merits) then the application is objectionable for the above reasons and also on account of its countryside location contrary to the spatial strategy in the development plan (inc. policies CS1, CS2, H7) and where material considerations do not outweigh the direction to refuse planning permission. Taken in the round, and accounting for the specific circumstances of the application, the most important policies for its determination are considered to be up to date in so**

far as they are applicable. However even if the “tilted balance” were to apply, the harms significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. However assessed, the application remains unacceptable and does not represent sustainable development.

### **133 SITE INSPECTION**

133.1 None requested.

The business of the meeting was concluded at 3.14 pm.

.....  
Chair