

## MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the **MSDC PLANNING** held in the King Edmund Chamber, Endeavour House, 8 Russell Road, Ipswich on Wednesday, 8 November 2023 at 09:30am.

### **PRESENT:**

Councillor: Sarah Mansel (Chair)  
Lavinia Hadingham (Vice-Chair)

Councillors: Austin Davies Lucy Elkin  
Nicholas Hardingham Terry Lawrence  
John Matthissen Rowland Warboys

### **Ward Member(s):**

Councillors: John Whitehead

### **In attendance:**

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

## **70 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE/SUBSTITUTIONS**

70.1 There were no apologies for absence.

## **71 TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS AND OTHER REGISTRABLE OR NON REGISTRABLE INTERESTS BY MEMBERS**

71.1 Councillor David Penny attended the meeting to speak as an Objector in his personal capacity in respect of application number DC/23/03872. The Planning Lawyer confirmed that if attending as a member of the committee, or speaking as a ward member, Councillor Penny would have a disclosable pecuniary interest as a neighbouring landowner but it had been agreed with the Interim Monitoring Officer that it was acceptable for Councillor Penny to speak as an Objector and leave the room before the start of the debate for the application.

## **72 DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING**

72.1 There were no declarations of lobbying.

## **73 DECLARATIONS OF PERSONAL SITE VISITS**

73.1 There were no declarations of personal site visits.

**74 MPL/23/16 CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 11 OCTOBER 2023**

It was **RESOLVED**:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 11 October 2023 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

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

75.1 None received.

**76 MPL/23/17 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

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

Application Number	Representations From
DC/23/00305	Paul Allen (Mendlesham Parish Council) Ben Elvin (Agent) Councillor Andrew Stringer (Ward Member)
DC/23/03872	Tina Newell (Hemingstone Parish Council) David Penny (Objector) Nick Barber (Agent) Councillor John Whitehead (Ward Member)

**77 DC/23/00305 LAND ADJACENT TO, 17 BROCKFORD ROAD, MENDLESHAM, IP14 5SG**

77.1 7A

Application DC/23/00305  
Proposal Full Planning Application – Change of use of land for grazing of horses, and erection of stables with new vehicular access  
Site Location Land Adjacent to, 17 Brockford Road, Mendlesham, IP14 5SG  
Applicant Moss and Humphreys

77.2 The Case Officer provided details to Members of the content of the Tabled Papers. An additional email received from the Heritage Team was circulated to Members to read. The Case Officer explained to Members how the comments from Heritage impacted the application.

- 77.3 The Case Officer introduced the application to the Committee outlining the proposal before Members including: the location of the site, the site constraints, the Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan (NP), the layout and proposed block plan of the site, the boundary treatments, the proposed landscaping scheme, existing access to the site, the location of adjacent dwellings and the view of the site, and the recommendation of approval subject to conditions as details in the Officer report.
- 77.4 The Case Officer responded to questions from Members on issues including: access to the site by larger vehicles, the previous planning applications at the site, the weight which should be given the Neighbourhood Plan, and the allocation of the site as visually important.
- 77.5 The Chief Planning Officer provided clarification to Members regarding the Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework and how this should be considered.
- 77.6 The Case Officer responded to further questions from Members on issues including: the location of the heritage assets, the size of the site, the boundary between the site and the adjacent cemetery, the Heritage comments regarding the orientation of the stable block, the existing pedestrian access to the site, and the changes made to this area in the revised 2022 Neighbourhood Plan.
- 77.7 Members considered the representation from Paul Allen who spoke on behalf of Mendlesham Parish Council.
- 77.8 The Parish Council representative responded to questions from Members on issues regarding the effects of the recent flooding in the village.
- 77.9 The Area Planning Manager responded to questions from Members and advised that the age or condition of the horses was not a material planning consideration.
- 77.10 The Area Planning Manager provided clarification to Members regarding the different types of outbuildings and applicable permitted developments rights.
- 77.11 Members considered the representation from Ben Elvin who spoke as the Agent.
- 77.12 The Agent responded to questions from Members on issues including: the permeability of the hardstanding for the parking area, the proposed lighting plans, the potential for the stable to be relocated as suggested by the Heritage team, and the potential for future development at the site.
- 77.13 The Chief Planning Officer and the Area Planning Manager responded to questions from Members regarding the conditions which could be applied to the application to restrict use to non-commercial only.
- 77.14 Members considered the representation from Councillor Andrew Stringer who

spoke as the Ward Member.

- 77.15 The Ward Member responded to questions from Members on issues including: the number of objections, and the inclusion of the view in the revised Neighbourhood Plan.
- 77.16 The Case Officer and the Area Planning Manager responded to questions from Members on issues including: the recent appeal decision in respect of the adjacent site, and the level of heritage harm and if a level of public benefit was required.
- 77.17 The Agent responded to a question regarding the heritage harm and commented on the late response from the Heritage team.
- 77.18 Members debated the application on issues including the importance of neighbourhood plans, the preservation of heritage assets, the lack of accessible bridleways near the site, the lateness of the response from the Heritage team, and the benefits of deferring the application to enable further consideration of the details contained in the response.
- 77.19 Members debated the benefits of a site inspection to enable a better understanding of the impact of the development on the heritage views.
- 77.20 Councillor Hadingham proposed that the application be deferred to enable a site inspection to be undertaken. Councillor Davies seconded the proposal.
- 77.21 Members continued to debate the application on issues including the neighbourhood plan, the heritage view, the advice received from the Heritage team, potential biodiversity net gain, the layout of the site, and the reasons for the site visit.

By a vote of 7 votes for and 1 against

**It was RESOLVED:**

**That the application be deferred to enable a site inspection to be carried out to review the size and siting of the stable building, with regards to the heritage harm and view 10, and the application to return to Committee.**

**78 DC/23/03872 HEMINGSTONE FRUIT FARM, MAIN ROAD, HEMINGSTONE, IP6 9RG**

78.1 Item 7B

Application Proposal	DC/23/03872 Planning Application – Erection of additional E(g) business unit building, and associated works
Site Location	Hemingstone Fruit Farm, Main Road, Hemingstone, IP6 6RG
Applicant	J Gorham

- 78.1 A break was taken from 11:13am until 11:25am, after application number DC/23/00305 and before the commencement of application number DC/23/03872.
- 78.2 The Case Officer introduced the application to the committee outlining the proposal before Members including: the planning history at the site, the location and constraints of the site, the proposed site layout, the proposed elevations, the existing access and car parking plans, the boundary between the existing and proposed car parking areas, and the recommendation of refusal as detailed in the Officer report.
- 78.3 The Case Officer and the Area Planning Manager responded to questions from Officers on issues including: the amount of undeveloped employment land in the district, and the comments received from the Heritage team.
- 78.4 Members considered the representation from Tina Newell who spoke on behalf of Hemingstone Parish Council.
- 78.5 Members considered the representation from David Penny who spoke as an Objector.
- 78.6 The Objector responded to questions from Members regarding potential noise and light pollution.
- 78.7 Members considered the representation from Nick Barber who spoke as the Agent.
- 78.8 The Agent responded to questions from Members on issues including: the use class of the existing units on site and whether any consideration had been given to a masterplan for the future of the site.
- 78.9 Members considered the representation from Councillor John Whitehead who spoke as the Ward Member.
- 78.10 David Penny left the meeting at 11:52, after the public speaking and before the debate.
- 78.11 Councillor Hadingham proposed that the application be refused as detailed in the Officer recommendation.
- 78.12 Councillor Lawrence seconded the proposal.
- 78.13 Following a question from Members, the Area Planning Manager provided clarification on the various business use classes.
- 78.14 Members debated the application on issues including: the ecological features of the building, and the location of the site.

By a unanimous vote

**It was RESOLVED:**

**That authority be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer to refuse planning permission for the following reason(s): -**

**The proposal represents new build commercial development in the countryside, where new build employment development is subject to a strategic, environmental, or operational justification. The applicant has failed to evidence a commercial need for the proposed development, nor have they provided strategic, environmental, or operational justification in regard to this location and therefore, the proposal is considered unacceptable in principle. The significant extension of the small-scale industrial site in the countryside would materially compromise the spatial strategy of the Council and undermines the aims and objectives of those policies. The proposal is contrary to: policies CS2, E9 and E10 of the Development Plan; emerging JLP policies SP03 and SP05; and is not considered to represent sustainable development when assessed against the provisions of the NPPF, taken as a whole.**

**79 SITE INSPECTION**

78.1 There were no requests for site inspections.

The business of the meeting was concluded at 12.00 pm.

.....  
Chair