

## MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the **MID SUFFOLK PLANNING REFERRALS COMMITTEE** held in the King Edmund Chamber - Endeavour House, 8 Russell Road, Ipswich on Wednesday, 14 February 2018- 2:00pm

### **PRESENT:**

Councillor: Matthew Hicks - Chair

Councillors:	Roy Barker	Gerard Brewster
	Michael Burke	David Burn
	John Field	Julie Flatman
	Jessica Fleming	Lavinia Hadingham
	Diana Kearsley	Anne Killett
	Sarah Mansel	Wendy Marchant
	Lesley Mayes	Derek Osborne
	David Whybrow	Kathie Guthrie

### **Ward Members:**

Councillors: John Whitehead  
James Caston

### **In attendance:**

Corporate Manager- Growth and Sustainable Planning (PI)  
Planning Lawyer (IDP)  
Principal Planning Officer (EF)  
Senior Development Management Engineer -Suffolk County Council Highways  
Department (SH)  
Governance Support Officer (RC)

### **58 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE/SUBSTITUTIONS**

58.1 An apology of absence was received from Councillors' Jane Storey, Keith Welham and Barry Humphreys MBE.

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

59.1 Councillor John Field declared a non-pecuniary interest in application DC/17/1832 as the County Councillor for the area of the application and as a Governor at Claydon Primary School.

59.2 Councillor David Whybrow declared a non-pecuniary interest in application DC/17/1832 as paragraph 150 in the Officer report referred to a separate application that his company was involved in.

60      **DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING**

60.1 All Members declared that they had been lobbied on application DC/17/1832.

61      **RF/17/10 CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 1 NOVEMBER 2017**

61.1 The Chair deferred the confirmation of the minutes until the next meeting of the Planning Referrals Committee.

62      **DECLARATIONS OF PERSONAL SITE VISITS**

62.1 Councillor Kathie Guthrie declared a personal site visit to application DC/17/1832.

63      **RF/17/11 SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS**

63.1 In accordance with the Council's procedure for public speaking on planning applications a representation was made as detailed below:

<b>Planning Application Number</b>	<b>Representations From</b>
DC/17/1832	Gail Cornish (Parish Council) Steven Bates (Objector) Gareth Barton (Agent) James Digby (Applicant)

63.2 Item 1

Application Proposal	DC/17/1832 Outline Application (Access to be considered) – Erection of up to 315 dwellings, vehicular access to Old Norwich Road, public open space and associated landscaping, engineering and infrastructure works.
Site Location	<b>CLAYDON</b> – Land to the West of Old Norwich Road and to the East of the A14, Claydon
Applicant	Ashfield Land Ltd.

63.3 The Corporate Manager – Growth and Sustainable Planning, advised Members' of a change to the Officer recommendation to the Archaeological works and Ecology.

63.4 The Case Officer presented the application to the Committee and outlined the additional conditions to the Officer Recommendation.

63.5 The Case Officer responded to Members' questions regarding development under power cables and cycling provision.

63.6 Sam Harvey, Senior Development Management Engineer for Suffolk County Council's Highways Department, responded to Members' questions regarding the realignment of Norwich Road and the cycling provision.

- 63.7 The Case Officer continued by responding to Members' questions regarding green belt land, ownership of the adjacent land, three storey developments, school provision, catchment areas, the impact of the A14 and emergency access to the site.
- 63.8 The Senior Development Management Engineer responded to Members' questions regarding the traffic modelling, the land ownership surrounding the junction and the bus gate.
- 63.9 The Case Officer continued to respond to Members' questions regarding the response from Mid Suffolk District Council's Environmental Health department.
- 63.10 Gail Cornish, Claydon Parish Council, outlined the scale of the development, that the village wanted to keep the buffer zone to Ipswich, that there would be 1000 extra traffic movements a day, and that the development would have implications for Ipswich.
- 63.11 The Parish Council representative responded to Members questions regarding the neighbourhood plan.
- 63.12 Steven Bates, Objector, outlined that the proposal failed to satisfy policies on many levels, that Ipswich Borough Council were opposed to the application, that the proposed highways link to the site was unsustainable, that the junction would be over capacity by 2022 and that the proposal should not be approved without a full site visit.
- 63.13 The Senior Development Management Engineer outlined that the highways modelling had taken into account any other applications.
- 63.14 Gareth Barton, Agent, outlined that statutory consultees had not raised significant objections, that the Council did not have a five year land supply, that the plan provided was only indicative, that emergency vehicles would be able to access the bus route, that 111 Affordable homes would be created and that there had been no objection from Suffolk County Council's Highways department.
- 63.15 The Agent and Applicant, James Digby, responded to Members' questions regarding the land surrounding the application.
- 63.16 Councillor James Caston, Ward Member, outlined the cumulative impact of applications in the area, that it would significantly alter the area, that Ipswich Borough Council did not support the application, that there would be a detrimental impact to existing residents, and that the level of the noise from the road would breach WHO limits and the placement of the affordable homes.
- 63.17 Councillor John Whitehead, Ward Member, outlined that Ipswich Borough Council had deemed the proposal as unsustainable development, that the application was in the countryside, that the only vehicle access would be from

Ipswich, that the local community wanted a buffer between Claydon and Ipswich, that there were serious concerns with regards to highways and that there were already significant highways issues in the area.

63.18 Members debated the application on the issues including, the location of the development, the lack of cycling provision, the impact on the highways network, the sustainability of the site, the cumulative impact, the amenity of occupants being next to the A14.

63.19 Councillor Jessica Fleming proposed that the application be refused on the grounds as follows:

1.The proposed development would reduce the open countryside separation between Claydon and Whitton and would fail to recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside and those communities contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 17 and would accordingly fail to conserve or enhance the local character of this part of the District contrary to policy FC1.1 of the adopted 2012 Core Strategy Focused Review.

2.The proposed development fails to secure appropriate ecological mitigation measures contrary to paragraph 115 of the NPPF and contrary to the principles of sustainable development in policies FC1 and FC1.1 of the adopted 2012 Core Strategy Focused Review.

3.The proposed development fails to satisfactorily address the cumulative impact of traffic arising from this development and others in the locality and would fail to safeguard safe and suitable access to the site for all people including cyclists and pedestrians. On that basis the development would be contrary to the principles of paragraph 32 NPPF and would fail to conserve or enhance this part of the District contrary to policies FC1 and FC1.1 of the adopted 2012 Core Strategy Focused Review.

4.The proposed development fails to provide and safeguard a high quality design and good standard of amenity having regard to the unacceptable potential impact upon residential amenity for existing residents within the locality of the site by reason of increased noise, activity and disturbance arising from the development and by reason of the absence of demonstrated noise mitigation to safeguard the amenity of future occupants. Contrary to policies FC1 and FC1.1 of the adopted 2012 Core Strategy Focused Review in that the development would not improve social and environmental conditions. Contrary to paragraph 17 NPPF in that, on the information to hand, the proposal would not deliver high quality design or a good standard of amenity.

5.The proposed development would fail to conserve or enhance the character of Whitton Conservation Area by reason if increased traffic and human activity which it would generate within that Conservation Area. This would constitute less than substantial harm to that heritage asset. Notwithstanding the public benefit in the delivery of new dwellings it is considered that the harm is of such considerable importance that permission should not be granted. On that

basis the proposal would be contrary to paragraph 134 NPPF and FC1.1 of the adopted 2012 Core Strategy Focused Review.

63.20 The Motion was seconded by Councillor Sarah Mansel.

63.21 Members' continued to debate the application on the issues including: the buffer between Claydon and Ipswich, the highways mitigations, the extra traffic created from the proposal and the sustainability of the development.

63.22 The Chair advised the Committee that Councillor Derek Osborne would not be taking part in the vote as he had left the chamber earlier in the proceedings.

63.23 By a unanimous vote

#### **63.24 RESOLVED**

##### **Refuse contrary to recommendation:**

**1.The proposed development would reduce the open countryside separation between Claydon and Whitton and would fail to recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside and those communities contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 17 and would accordingly fail to conserve or enhance the local character of this part of the District contrary to policy FC1.1 of the adopted 2012 Core Strategy Focused Review.**

**2.The proposed development fails to secure appropriate ecological mitigation measures contrary to paragraph 115 of the NPPF and contrary to the principles of sustainable development in policies FC1 and FC1.1 of the adopted 2012 Core Strategy Focused Review.**

**3.The proposed development fails to satisfactorily address the cumulative impact of traffic arising from this development and others in the locality and would fail to safeguard safe and suitable access to the site for all people including cyclists and pedestrians. On that basis the development would be contrary to the principles of paragraph 32 NPPF and would fail to conserve or enhance this part of the District contrary to policies FC1 and FC1.1 of the adopted 2012 Core Strategy Focused Review.**

**4.The proposed development fails to provide and safeguard a high quality design and good standard of amenity having regard to the unacceptable potential impact upon residential amenity for existing residents within the locality of the site by reason of increased noise, activity and disturbance arising from the development and by reason of the absence of demonstrated noise mitigation to safeguard the amenity of future occupants. Contrary to policies FC1 and FC1.1 of the adopted 2012 Core Strategy Focused Review in that the development would not improve social and environmental conditions. Contrary to paragraph 17 NPPF in that, on the information to hand, the proposal would not deliver high quality design or a good standard of amenity.**

**5.The proposed development would fail to conserve or enhance the character of Whitton Conservation Area by reason if increased traffic and human activity which it would generate within that Conservation Area. This would constitute less than substantial harm to that heritage asset. Notwithstanding the public benefit in the delivery of new dwellings it is considered that the harm is of such considerable importance that permission should not be granted. On that basis the proposal would be contrary to paragraph 134 NPPF and FC1.1 of the adopted 2012 Core Strategy Focused Review.**

The business of the meeting was concluded at 4.10 pm.

.....

Chairman