

## **BABERGH DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Minutes of the meeting of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** held in the Frink Room (Elisabeth)  
- Endeavour House on Wednesday, 15 June 2022 at 09:30am.

### **PRESENT:**

Councillor: Stephen Plumb (Chair)  
Leigh Jamieson (Vice-Chair)

Councillors:	Sue Ayres	Peter Beer
	David Busby	Siân Dawson
	John Hinton	Alastair McCraw
	Mary McLaren	Adrian Osborne
	Alison Owen	

### **In attendance:**

Officers: Chief Planning Officer (PI)  
Strategic Projects and Delivery Manager (SS)  
Area Planning Manager (MR)  
Planning Lawyer (IDP)  
Case Officers (JH/JME)  
Governance Officer (CP)

## **1 SUBSTITUTES AND APOLOGIES**

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Councillor Simon Barrett and Councillor Michael Holt.
- 1.2 Councillor Sue Ayres substituted for Councillor Barrett.
- 1.3 Councillor Sian Sawson substituted for Councillor Holt.

## **2 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

- 2.1 There were no declarations of interest declared.

## **3 PL/22/1 TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 27 APRIL 2022**

It was **RESOLVED:**

**That the minutes of the meeting held on 27 April 2022 were confirmed and signed as a true record.**

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

4.1 None received.

## 5 SITE INSPECTIONS

5.1 The Case Officer presented Members with a request for a site visit regarding application numbers DC/21/05110 and DC/22/01605. The Case Officer provided Members with details of the applications including: the location and layout of the sites, and the reasons the site visits had been requested.

5.2 The Case Officer responded to questions from Members on issues regarding: whether the two sites were related, and access to the sites.

5.3 The Ward Member, Councillor Busby, provided Members with details of the reason for requesting the site visit which included access to the sites, and drainage issues.

5.4 Councillor McLaren proposed that a site visit be undertaken for both applications.

5.5 Councillor Owen seconded the proposal.

By a unanimous vote

**It was RESOLVED:**

**That a site visit be undertaken in respect of application numbers DC/21/05110 and DC/22/01605.**

## 6 PL/22/2 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/22/2 and the speakers responded to questions put to them as provided for under those arrangements.

Application No.	Representations from
DC/19/00567	Helen Davies (Sproughton Parish Council) Rhona Jermyn (Objector) Rob Snowling (Applicant) Councillor Zac Norman (Ward Member)
DC/20/05137	Leslie Short (Agent)

**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/22/2 be made as follows:-**

**7 DC/19/00567 LAND NORTH OF, BURSTALL LANE, SPROUGHTON, IPSWICH, IP8 3DE**

7.1 Item 6A

Application Proposal	DC/19/00567 Hybrid Application comprising: Outline Planning Application (Access to be considered) for the erection of up to 92 homes and 13 self-build/custom build plots (including provision of up to 37 affordable homes); open space, including a village wood; land for community use/ local shops/ office space; land for a village car park; land for an extension to existing village allotments; land for paddocks; land for relocated and enhanced caravan storage provision; safeguarded land for potential future relief road; new public right of way and associated infrastructure provision. Full planning application for spine road between Loraine Way and Burstall Lane (including accesses onto Burstall Lane and Loraine Way); access for proposed caravan storage area; accesses for self-build plots from Burstall Lane; and associated drainage and highway works (including formation of passing bays on Burstall Lane)
Site Location	<b>SPROUGHTON</b> – Land North of, Burstall Lane, Sproughton, Ipswich, IP8 3DE
Applicant	Pigeon Land 2 Ltd and The Felix Thornley Cobbold Agricultural Trust

7.2 The Case Officer presented the application to the Committee outlining the proposal before Members including: the reason for the application returning to Committee following its resolution to grant by the Committee in October 2022 and the amendments made to the relevant material planning considerations since the previous recommendation to Committee, the location and proposed layout of the site, access to the site, the proposed highway works and improvements, the proposed landscaping plan, potential heritage and sustainability issues, the contents of the tabled papers, and the officer recommendation of approval.

7.3 The Case Officer and the Strategic Projects and Delivery Manager responded to questions from Members on issues including: the access to the site, the location of the zebra crossing, the proposed landscaping plans and the timescale for landscaping to be in place, whether affordable housing for local connections had been considered, whether the site was an allocated site within the Joint Local Plan (JLP) and how the numbers of dwellings being proposed compared to the number allocated in the JLP, the location of the listed buildings, responsibility for green open spaces and the relief road surrounding the site, proposed infrastructure plans, sustainability measures, proposed cycle paths, public transport links, construction traffic, and construction operating hours.

- 7.4 Members considered the representation from Helen Davies who spoke on behalf of Sproughton Parish Council.
- 7.5 The Parish Council representative responded to questions from Members on issues including: the public transport provision in the area.
- 7.6 Members considered the representation from Rhona Jermyn who spoke as an objector.
- 7.7 The objector responded to questions from Members on issues including: whether any accidents had occurred at the crossroads adjacent to the Public House.
- 7.8 Members considered the representation from Rob Snowling who spoke as the applicant.
- 7.9 The applicant, and Simon Butler-Finbow, also representing the applicant, responded to questions from Members on issues including: proposed safety plans for the SUDS area, whether consultation had taken place with the Parish Council and plans for future communication to ensure community involvement, and whether the applicant intended to carry out the building works themselves.
- 7.10 Members considered the representation from Councillor Norman who spoke as the Ward Member.
- 7.11 The Governance Officer read out a statement from Ward Member, Councillor Hardacre, who was unable to attend the meeting.
- 7.12 Members debated the application on issues including: the need for housing in the area, heritage concerns, traffic issues, the size of the proposed development, proposed access plans, and sustainability concerns.
- 7.13 The Case Officer responded to a question from Members regarding the number of recorded traffic incidents.
- 7.14 Councillor Hinton proposed that the application be refused.
- 7.15 Councillor Jamieson seconded the proposal.
- 7.16 Members continued to debate the application on issues including: the potential heritage and landscape harm, and the proposed landscaping plan.
- 7.16 A short break was taken from 11:44am to 11:57am.
- 7.17 The Strategic Projects and Delivery Manager confirmed the reasons for the application to be refused as detailed below:
1. The circumstances of the application and the proposed development are

not exceptional and are without a proven justifiable need, contrary to policies CS2, CS11, and CS15. The quantum of development fails to respect local circumstances and the very clear role that Sproughton village is expected to play in the Council's spatial strategy, contrary to those aforementioned policies and the NPPF.

2. The proposed development is considered likely to lead to a high level of less than substantial harm to the settings of the Grade II listed building of the Grindle House and a high level of less than substantial harm to the setting of the group of historic buildings in the village core (including the Grade II Sproughton Hall, Root Barn and Tithe Barn, Wild Man Public House, Sproughton Mill and Mill House and the Grade II\* listed All Saints Church in Sproughton), and is not considered to respect the features that contribute positively to the setting and significance of these listed buildings, conflicting with Babergh Local Plan (2006) policy CN06, not respecting these heritage assets, the heritage characteristics of the village or historic views of heritage assets contrary to Babergh Core Strategy and Policies (2014) policies CS11 and CS15. Further to this, the public benefits of the scheme are not considered to outweigh this harm, making the proposal contrary to the heritage policies of the NPPF.
  
3. The proposed development would adversely affect the important landscape setting to the village of Sproughton and would be harmful to a designated Special Landscape Area. It is not agreed that such harm could be adequately mitigated on account of the transformational change that is proposed to landscape character. The application is therefore contrary to policies CR04, CS11, and CS15 of the development plan, and the NPPF.

The development conflicts with the development plan when taken as a whole and there are no material considerations which indicate that a decision should be taken other than in accordance with the development plan.

***In the event that an appeal against the refusal of planning permission is received, delegate authority to the Chief Planning Officer to defend that appeal for the reasons set out, being amended and/or varied as may be required.***

7.18 The proposer and seconder agreed to the reasons for refusal.

By a unanimous vote

It was RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be refused for the following reasons:

1. The circumstances of the application and the proposed development are not exceptional and are without a proven justifiable need, contrary to policies CS2, CS11, and CS15. The quantum of development fails to respect local circumstances and the very clear role that Sproughton village is expected to play in the Council's spatial strategy, contrary to those aforementioned policies and the NPPF.
2. The proposed development is considered likely to lead to a high level of less than substantial harm to the settings of the Grade II listed building of the Grindle House and a high level of less than substantial harm to the setting of the group of historic buildings in the village core (including the Grade II Sproughton Hall, Root Barn and Tithe Barn, Wild Man Public House, Sproughton Mill and Mill House and the Grade II\* listed All Saints Church in Sproughton), and is not considered to respect the features that contribute positively to the setting and significance of these listed buildings, conflicting with Babergh Local Plan (2006) policy CN06, not respecting these heritage assets, the heritage characteristics of the village or historic views of heritage assets contrary to Babergh Core Strategy and Policies (2014) policies CS11 and CS15. Further to this, the public benefits of the scheme are not considered to outweigh this harm, making the proposal contrary to the heritage policies of the NPPF.
3. The proposed development would adversely affect the important landscape setting to the village of Sproughton and would be harmful to a designated Special Landscape Area. It is not agreed that such harm could be adequately mitigated on account of the transformational change that is proposed to landscape character. The application is therefore contrary to policies CR04, CS11, and CS15 of the development plan, and the NPPF.

The development conflicts with the development plan when taken as a whole and there are no material considerations which indicate that a decision should be taken other than in accordance with the development plan.

***In the event that an appeal against the refusal of planning permission is received, delegate authority to the Chief Planning Officer to defend that appeal for the reasons set out, being amended and/or varied as may be required.***

8      **DC/20/05137 LAND AT COBBOLDS FARM, IPSWICH ROAD, HADLEIGH, IP7 6BG**

8.1      Item 6B

Application Proposal	DC/20/05137 Outline Planning Application. (Access and Landscaping to be considered) Employment land for use as Class E Business buildings up to 1900m <sup>2</sup> and Classes B2 and B8 buildings up to 4200m <sup>2</sup> Note: Whilst the applicant has described the total level of floorspace being proposed as 6,100sq.m. Members are advised that if they are minded to grant planning permission and they have considered the merits of the proposed development based on a ceiling of 6,100sq.m. then the floorspace ceiling should be conditioned. This will ensure that there is no confusion later and that the implications of additional floorspace and the principle can be properly addressed via a new application.
Site Location	HADLEIGH – Land at Cobbolds Farm, Ipswich Road, Hadleigh, Ipswich, Suffolk, IP7 6BG
Applicant	Mr Philip Munson

- 8.2 The Chief Planning Officer provided Members with an overview of the planning history for the application and drew Members attention to the correspondence received from the applicant since publication of the meeting agenda.
- 8.3 The Case Officer presented the application to the Committee outlining the proposal before Members including: the location and layout of the site, the proposed use of the land, access to the site, the proposed landscaping plans, the previous planning applications at the site, and the Officer recommendation of refusal as detailed in the Committee report.
- 8.4 The Case Officer responded to questions from Members on issues including: the public transport provision in the area, overnight parking at the site, and existing employment land in the area.
- 8.5 Members considered the representation from Leslie Short who spoke as the Agent.
- 8.6 The Agent, the Case Officer and the Strategic Projects and Delivery Manager responded to questions from Members on issues including: the proposed use of the buildings including employment opportunities, any amendments made to the proposal since the application was previously presented to Members, whether alternative employment land in the area had been considered by the Applicant, and proposed sustainability plans.
- 8.7 Members debated the application on issues including: the existing infrastructure, the number of premises in the area for business use, the proposed landscaping plans, ecological issues, the suitability of the location, and sustainability issues.

8.8 The Case Officer responded to further questions from Members on issues including: the surface area material, and the location of the bund around the development site.

8.9 Councillor McCraw proposed that the application be refused.

8.10 Councillor Osborne seconded the proposal.

By a vote of 7 votes 7, and 4 votes against

**It was RESOLVED:**

**That authority be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer to refuse planning permission as recommended and to finalise and clarify the decision notice with such further reasons as he considers appropriate.**

The business of the meeting was concluded at 13:15pm.

.....  
Chair