

Guthrie, Councillor Hicks, Councillor Humphreys MBE, Councillor Norris and Councillor Passmore.

3 TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS AND OTHER REGISTERABLE OR NON REGISTERABLE INTERESTS BY MEMBERS

3.1 There were no declarations of interest declared.

4 DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING

4.1 There were no declaration of lobbying.

5 DECLARATIONS OF PERSONAL SITE VISITS

5.1 There were no declarations of personal site visits.

6 RF/22/1 CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 27 JANUARY 2021

It was RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 27 Janaury 2021 were confirmed and signed as a true record.

7 RF/22/2 CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 19 MARCH 2021

It was RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 19 March 2021 were confirmed and signed as a true record.

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

8.1 None received.

9 RF/22/3 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

9.1 In accordance with the Council's procedure for public speaking on planning applications representations were made as detailed below:

Application Number	Representations From
DC/19/02090	Julian West (Thurston Parish Council) Councillor Austin Davies (Ward Member) Councillor Harry Richardson (Ward Member)

10 DC/19/02090 LAND TO THE EAST OF IXWORTH ROAD, THURSTON, SUFFOLK

10.1 Item 8A

Application Proposal	DC/29/02090 Outline Planning Application (some matter reserved) – Erection of up to 210 dwellings and new vehicular access to include planting and landscaping, natural and semi- natural green space including community growing space(s), children’s play area and sustainable drainage system (SuDS), to include 35% affordable dwellings.
Site Location	THURSTON – Land to the East of, Ixworth Road, Thurston, Suffolk
Applicant	Gladman

10.2 The Case Officer introduced the application to the Committee outlining the proposal before Members including: the location of the site and surrounding developments, the planning history of the site and previous presentations to Committee, the material changes in circumstance since the application was last considered by Committee, the proposed access to the development including emergency and pedestrian access routes, the proposed cycleways, the landscape buffer belt, the proposed layout of the site including the areas of open space, the proposed plans for recreational areas including the skate park, the improved connectivity plans and public transport links, the proposed locations for the pedestrian crossing, the proposed highway improvements, the healthcare provision in the area, biodiversity enhancements, and the officer recommendation of refusal.

10.3 Following a question from Members, the Planning Lawyer confirmed that following referral to the Supreme Court, permission for an appeal had been declined.

10.3 The Case Officer and the Chief Planning Officer responded to questions from Members on issues including: the housing land supply position statement, the healthcare provision in the area, the pedestrian and cycle access and how these connect to existing footpaths, the access to the proposed pedestrian crossing, the distance from the proposed skate park to the residential area, the policies within the Neighbourhood Plan and how these related to the development, the impact on the proposed road highway safety improvements should the application be refused, the date the traffic data detailed in the report was obtained, and the capacity at the water treatment centre.

10.4 Members considered the representation from Julian West who spoke on behalf of Thurston Parish Council.

10.5 Members considered the representation from Ward Member Councillor Davies who spoke against the application.

10.6 Members considered the representation from Ward Member Councillor

Richardson who spoke against the application.

- 10.7 Councillor Richardson responded to a question from Members regarding the response from Suffolk County Highways in respect of highways improvements.
- 10.8 A break was taken from 15:55 break until 16:03.
- 10.9 Members debated the application on issues including: the housing need in the area, and whether the benefits of the application outweigh any potential harm.
- 10.10 Councillor Meyer proposed that the application be refused as detailed in the officer recommendation.
- 10.11 Councillor Stringer seconded the proposal.
- 10.12 Members continued to debate the application on issues including: the highways assessment.
- 10.13 Councillor Meyer and Councillor Stringer agreed to the following additional informative:

That the Council notes the interest and concern locally regarding the mitigation of highway issues and in the interest of public confidence invites the Secretary of State Inspector to ensure that this aspect is given proper review in reaching their decision at the forthcoming appeal.

- 10.14 Members debated the application further on issues including: the potential highways impact, the housing need, and the five-year housing land supply.

By a unanimous vote

It was RESOLVED:

- 1. That Members resolve to: refuse planning permission, or in the event that the appeal has begun agree a putative reason for refusal, for the following reason: "The proposed development located, as it would be, outside the defined settlement boundary for Thurston and within the countryside, is contrary to Mid Suffolk's Core Strategy policies CS1 and CS2 and Local Plan policy H7. The application would not comply with the development plan as a whole. In applying the tilted balance, and recognising the primacy of the development plan, the harm in allowing a significant number of further dwellings to be released in the absence of any real and demonstrable district or local need, contrary to the development plan, significantly and demonstrably outweighs the benefits."**

And

- 2. That Members delegate authority to the Chief Planning Officer to defend the appeal for the reasons set out under 1 . above, being amended**

**and/or varied as may be required.
And the following additional informative:**

That the Council notes the interest and concern locally regarding the mitigation of highway issues and in the interest of public confidence invites the Secretary of State Inspector to ensure that this aspect is given proper review in reaching their decision at the forthcoming appeal.

The business of the meeting was concluded at 4.20 pm.

.....
Chair