

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the **MSDC PLANNING** held in the Frink Room (Elisabeth) - Endeavour House on Wednesday, 20 December 2023

PRESENT:

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

Councillors: Austin Davies
Terry Lawrence
John Matthissen
Nicholas Hardingham
Colin Lay
Rowland Warboys

Ward Member(s):

Councillors: Andrew Stringer

In attendance:

Officers: Area Planning Manager (GW)
Planning Lawyer (CF)
Senior Heritage Officer (TP)
Planning Officer (AS)
Governance Officer (AN)

Apologies:

Councillors: Lucy Elkin

91 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE/SUBSTITUTIONS

91.1 Apologies were received from Councillor Lucy Elkin.

91.2 Councillor Colin Lay substituted for Councillor Elkin.

92 TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS AND OTHER REGISTRABLE OR NON REGISTRABLE INTERESTS BY MEMBERS

92.1 None declared.

93 DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING

93.1 None declared.

94 DECLARATIONS OF PERSONAL SITE VISITS

94.1 None declared.

95 MPL/23/20 CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 6 DECEMBER 2023

95.1 Councillor Warboys raised an issue with the reasons for refusal documented in respect of application number DC/22/01530 in relation to the statement included that “The Council has permitted other solar schemes which generate substantially more solar power and are less harmful to fewer designated heritage assets than this proposal.”.

95.2 The Area Planning Manager confirmed this to be an error in the decision notice, picked up on and rectified after the committee had taken place, and proposed that the following note be added to the minutes:

“The reason noted above was as presented to Members but was later confirmed to include an inaccuracy. The Council cannot determine solar schemes larger than 49.9mW. The reason was amended, in agreement with the Chief Planning Officer, prior to issue as follows:

In accordance with paragraph 202 of the NPPF, the proposal offers significant public benefits when viewed in the wider context of the district. The Council has permitted other solar schemes which are less harmful to fewer designated heritage assets than this proposal. The proposal’s contribution to reducing carbon emissions, mitigating climate change, and improving energy security is not considered to be substantial enough to outweigh the medium to high level of less than substantial harm to the numerous aforementioned designated heritage assets.”

95.3 Councillor Matthissen proposed an amendment to 89.4 to correct his ward from Needham Market to Onehouse.

95.4 Councillor Hardingham proposed an amendment to 89.11 to not objectively define the number of objections received from local residents in relation to application number DC/22/01530. The Governance Officer responded that the word “low” would be removed from this sentence.

95.5 Councillor Matthissen proposed that the minutes of the meeting held on 6th December 2023 be approved and signed as a true record with the inclusion of the proposed amendments.

95.6 Councillor Hardingham seconded the motion.

It was RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 6th December 2023 with the proposed amendments be confirmed and signed as a true record.

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

96.1 None received.

97 MPL/23/21 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

Application Number	Representations From
DC/23/00305	Ben Elvin (Agent) Councillor Andrew Stringer (Ward Member)

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

98.1 Item 7A

Application Proposal	DC/23/00305 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

98.2 The Case Officer introduced the application to the committee outlining the proposal before Members including: the ward member’s call-in request, the requested site visit from committee members, the location of the site, the constraints of the site, the Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan, the proposed block plan, the proposed elevations and floor plans, the potential impact on views, and the Officer recommendation for approval.

98.3 The Case Officer responded to questions from Members on issues including: the planning history of the site, the flood zones intersecting the site, access to the site, and potential heritage harm.

98.4 Members considered the representation from Ben Elvin who spoke as the Agent.

98.5 The Agent responded to questions from Members on issues including: potential commercial use of the paddock, land designated to be left as open grassland, and existing hard standings on the site.

98.6 Members considered the representation from Councillor Andrew Stringer who spoke as the Ward Member.

98.7 Members debated the application on issues including: the Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan, the potential impact on open views and vistas, the reduction of open space, the planning history of the site, the potential degree of less than substantial harm, the proposed location of the stables on the site, grazing of horses, and the proposed landscaping.

98.8 Councillor Lawrence proposed that the application be refused for the following reasons:

The proposal is situated within the setting of the nearby Grade I Listed Church and Conservation Area.

The proposal would have a very low level of less than substantial harm to the heritage assets, and the public benefits of this proposal are not considered to outweigh the harm identified, contrary to NPPF paragraph 208 and JLP policy LP19.

The proposed building would, whilst relating to a countryside use nonetheless by reason of its size and location impact on the protected view, and landscape character contrary to Neighbourhood Plan Policy MP10, and JLP Policies LP17 and LP20.

98.9 Councillor Davies seconded the motion.

By a vote of 6 For and 2 Against

It was RESOLVED:

That the Chief Planning Officer be authorised to refuse planning permission as summarised below and as may be deemed necessary by the Chief Planning Officer:

The proposal is situated within the setting of the nearby Grade I Listed Church and Conservation Area.

The proposal would have a very low level of less than substantial harm to the heritage assets, and the public benefits of this proposal are not considered to outweigh the harm identified, contrary to NPPF paragraph 208 and JLP policy LP19.

The proposed building would, whilst relating to a countryside use nonetheless by reason of its size and location impact on the protected view, and landscape character contrary to Neighbourhood Plan Policy MP10, and JLP Policies LP17 and LP20.

99 SITE INSPECTION

99.1 None received.

The business of the meeting was concluded at 18:32pm.

.....
Chair