

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNCIL OFFICES, CORKS LANE, HADLEIGH ON WEDNESDAY, 25 NOVEMBER 2015

PRESENT: Peter Beer - Chairman

Melanie Barrett	Lee Parker
Sue Burgoyne	Stephen Plumb
David Busby	Nick Ridley
Michael Creffield	David Rose
Derek Davis	Ray Smith
Michael Holt	Stephen Williams
Adrian Osborne	

Peter Burgoyne, Ward Member for Pinewood, was present at the meeting and spoke on Application No. B/14/01377/OUT in Paper R64 with the consent of the Chairman. For clarity, he referred to his membership of the Greenways Project JAC as the Council's representative.

Mark Newman, Ward Member for Great Cornard (South), was present at the meeting and spoke on Application No. B/15/01379/FUL in Paper R65 with the consent of the Chairman.

Barry Gasper, Ward Member for Brook, was present at the meeting and spoke on Application No. B/15/0093/FUL in Paper R66 with the consent of the Chairman.

71 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

David Busby declared a local non-pecuniary interest in [Paper R64](#) by reason of being a volunteer at Belstead Brook Park and the Council's representative on Greenways Countryside Project JAC, which did not prevent him from speaking or voting on the matter.

72 MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the Minutes of the meeting held on [28 October 2015](#) be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

73 PETITIONS

None received.

74 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS

None received.

75 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION BY THE COMMITTEE

Members had before them an Addendum to each of [Papers R64](#), [R65](#) and [R66](#) (circulated to Members prior to the commencement of the meeting) summarising additional correspondence received since the publication of the Agenda, but before noon on the working day before the meeting, together with errata.

Details of further representations received in respect of the item contained in Paper R66 were reported to the meeting and considered and taken into account before a decision was made on the item.

In accordance with the Council's Charter on Public Speaking at Planning Committee, representations were made as detailed below relating to items contained in Papers [R64](#), [R65](#) and [R66](#), and speakers responded to questions put to them as provided for in the Charter:-

Application No. Representations from

Paper R64

B/14/01377/OUT Mrs B Calver (Parish Council)
Mr A Harding (Applicant)

Paper R65

B/15/01336/FHA Mr C Totman (Parish Council)
Mrs D Bezant (Objector)

B/15/00956/FUL Mr C Totman (Parish Council)
Mr P Wright (Objector)
Mr R Balmer (Agent for Applicant)

B/15/01379/FUL Mr D Pearce (Agent for Applicant)

Paper R66

B/15/00993/FUL Mr S Curl (Sproughton Parish Council)
Mr P Eaton (Chattisham and Hintlesham Parish Councils)
Mr M Watling (Copdock and Washbrook Parish Council)
Mrs B Calver (Pinewood Parish Council)
Mr C Harris (Objector)
Mr J Bailey (Agent for Applicant)

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 R64 be made as follows:-

(a) PINWOOD

Application No. B/14/01377/OUT [Paper R64 – Item 1](#) Outline application – Residential development for the provision of 155 dwellings and 65 bedroom care home, Belstead House, Sprites Lane.

Colin Bird, Development Management Engineer, Suffolk County Council, was present at the meeting to answer questions relating to highway matters. In addition to both Corporate Managers for Development Management who were present, the Corporate Managers for Spatial Planning Policy and Strategic Housing were also in attendance.

Prior to presenting the application, the Case Officer drew Members’ attention to the amended recommendation in the Addendum to Paper R64.

During the debate that ensued Members recognised that there was a need for the mix of assisted-living housing which the application was intended to provide, and accepted that the scheme would preserve the Listed Building but considered that the proposal raised various matters including:

- the loss of some green space,
- any potential effect on the local health facilities,
- the methodology used for the Traffic Survey report,
- highway-related issues including construction traffic management

Colin Bird confirmed that the highway impacts of this proposal were considered to be less than ‘severe’ and consequently there could be no objection on highway grounds. The LHA was satisfied with the inclusion of Planning Obligations for highway-related items which included public transport infrastructure, bridleway 39 improvements and travel plan contributions, and would require appropriate conditions to be attached to any grant of planning permission.

Members also noted that NHS England had identified the sum of £57,880 to be provided through the Section 106 Agreement towards additional health care provision (paragraph 60 of Paper R64, Item 1 refers).

The recommendation of Christine Thurlow, Corporate Manager – Development Management to grant outline planning permission, as set out in the Addendum, was moved but lost on being put to the vote. Members then considered whether there were grounds for refusal in relation to Policies CS02, CS14, CS21 and HS31. However, on the basis that there was no identifiable harm and no objection from the LHA, a motion of refusal was not moved. No alternative motion was put forward at this point.

The Chairman then called a short adjournment to allow the officers to discuss with the Applicant any possible measures to mitigate concerns raised by Members during the debate which included:-

- site construction controls
- the possibility of a 'buffer strip' within the application site
- traffic calming / management

When the meeting resumed, Christine Thurlow reported back on the proposed content of additional Planning Obligations which could be included in the Section 106 Agreement to address the concerns identified above. A further brief adjournment was taken to enable a specific point to be clarified, following which Mrs Thurlow confirmed that the proposed Obligations would cover the following:-

- the site construction controls to be strengthened by making the Construction Management Plan the subject of a Planning Obligation (instead of being covered by a condition of any planning permission which might be granted)
- the provision within the application site of a 2m buffer strip which would not be developed
- upon occupation of the 50th dwelling, up to £50,000 for traffic calming / management measures (which could include signage) along Cottingham Road and towards the Scrivener Drive junction.

The Chairman exercised his discretion under the Charter for Public Speaking to enable the public speakers to make further representations. He moved the recommendation as set out in the Addendum with the inclusion of the proposed additional Obligations, and this was seconded, following which the Pinewood representative and the Applicant made further comments to the meeting. The revised recommendation was carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED

(1) That the Corporate Manager - Development Management be authorised to secure a Planning Obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990, to provide:-

- **Provision and management of public open space;**
- **Affordable Housing as agreed;**
- **As may be agreed with LHA;**
- **As required by HRA Screening Report;**
- **Education - £255,801 (or an appropriate level as advised/required by SCC)**
- **Public Transport Infrastructure - £28,000 (or an appropriate level as advised/required by SCC)**
- **Bridleway 39 Improvements - £5,000**
- **Travel Plan Contributions - to be agreed**
- **Libraries - £29,592 (or an appropriate level as advised/required by SCC)**
- **Waste - £6,987 (or an appropriate level as advised/required by SCC)**
- **NHS England - £57,880**
- **As required by the Corporate Manager - Public Realm**
- **Construction Management Plan to be agreed with LPA**
- **Provision within the application site of a 2m buffer strip which would not be developed**

- Upon occupation of the 50th dwelling, up to £50,000 for traffic calming/management measures (which could include signage) along Cottingham Road and towards the Scrivener Drive junction.

(2) That, subject to the completion of the Planning Obligation in Resolution (1) above, the Corporate Manager - Development Management be authorised to grant outline Planning Permission subject to conditions including:-

- Standard time limit and Reserved Matters conditions;
- Parking to be provided in accordance with adopted standards;
- Materials samples;
- Quantum of total dwellings fixed;
- As required by Corporate Manager - Strategic Housing;
- As required by Corporate Manager - Heritage;
- Removal of PD rights to Belstead House LB dwellings
- 10% of agreed predicted energy use to be derived from renewable sources, with details to be approved (Policy CS13);
- Any external lighting to be approved;
- As required by Corporate Manager - Environmental Protection, where relevant;
- Full soft/hard landscaping including screening details, and as required by SCC Landscaping Team (including arboricultural protection measures);
- As required by SCC Highway Authority;
- As required by SCC Ecology/in accordance with ecological appraisal;
- As required by HRA Screening Report/Natural England;
- As required by Anglian Water;
- As required by Arboricultural Officer;
- Surface water drainage, as required by SCC, Anglian Water and Environment Agency;
- As required by SCC Archaeology;
- Fire hydrant provision;
- Agreement of Emergency Access treatment/control;
- Agreement of waste management plan;
- Agreement of landscape management plan;
- Care home to be no more than three-storeys in height;
- Slab levels.
- Details of all footways on site (together with an informative on any decision notice which addresses the Pinewood Parish Council's concerns about a footpath crossing the site so that its status and existence can be taken into account and embraced in any layout proposed for development of the site at the reserved matters stage).

(3) That, in the event of the Planning Obligation referred to in Resolution (1) above not being secured the Corporate Manager - Development Management be authorised to refuse outline Planning Permission, for reason(s) including:-

- Inadequate provision of infrastructure contributions which would fail to provide compensatory benefits to the sustainability of the development and its wider impacts, contrary to Policy CS21 of the Core Strategy.

(b) PINWOOD

**Application Nos. B/14/01375/FUL
and B/14/01376/LBC
Paper R64 – Item 2**

Full application – Change of use and conversion of Belstead House to provide 4 dwellings; Conversion of dining hall to form 1 dwelling; Conversion and extension of pottery building to a dwelling; Conversion and extension of thatched barn to dwelling; Demolition of prefabricated classroom building; Erection of 13 dwellings together with alterations to access; Formation of parking areas and associated landscape works (as amended/amplified, Belstead House, Sprites Lane, and application for Listed Building Consent - Internal and external alterations to Belstead House in connection with conversion to 5 dwelling houses including conversion of existing dining hall together with conversion of outbuildings to dwellings and demolition of former classroom, Belstead House, Sprites Lane.

RESOLVED

- (1) That the Corporate Manager - Development Management be authorised to secure a Planning Obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990, to provide:-**
- Education - an appropriate level as advised/required by SCC.**
 - Libraries - an appropriate level as advised/required by SCC.**
 - Public Transport Infrastructure - an appropriate level as advised/required by SCC.**
 - Waste - an appropriate level as advised/required by SCC.**
 - Public Open Space.**
- (2) That, subject to the completion of the Planning Obligation in Resolution (1) above, the Corporate Manager - Development Management be authorised to grant Planning Permission subject to conditions including:-**
- Standard time limit;**
 - Development in accordance with approved plans;**
 - Materials samples;**
 - As required by Corporate Manager - Heritage;**
 - Removal of PD rights to Belstead House LB dwellings.**

- Agreement of construction management plan;
 - 10% of agreed predicted energy use to be derived from renewable sources, with details to be approved;
 - Any external lighting to be approved;
 - As required by Corporate Manager - Environmental Protection, where relevant;
 - Full soft/hard landscaping including screening details, and as required by SCC Landscaping Team (including arboricultural protection measures);
 - As required by SCC Highway Authority;
 - As required by SCC Ecology/in accordance with ecological appraisal;
 - Surface water drainage, as required by SCC, Anglian Water and Environment Agency;
 - As required by SCC Archaeology;
 - Fire hydrant provision;
 - Agreement of waste management plan;
 - Agreement of landscape management plan.
- (3) That, in the event of the Planning Obligation referred to in Resolution (1) above not being secured the Corporate Manager - Development Management be authorised to refuse Planning Permission, for reason(s) including:-
- Inadequate provision of infrastructure contributions which would fail to provide compensatory benefits to the sustainability of the development and its wider impacts, contrary to Policy CS21 of the Core Strategy.
- (4) That Listed Building Consent be granted subject to conditions including:-
- Standard time limit;
 - Works in accordance with approved plans;
 - Materials samples;
 - As recommended by the Corporate Manager - Heritage.

76 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION BY THE COMMITTEE
(continued)

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 R65 be made as follows:-

(c) EAST BERGHOLT

**Application No. B/15/01336/FHA
Paper R65 – Item 1**

Full application - Erection of first floor extension, single-storey extension, front and rear porch canopies and conservatory, Westmead House, Gaston End.

Notwithstanding the officer recommendation to grant planning permission subject to conditions, a motion to refuse permission on grounds relating to overdevelopment was proposed but failed to attract a seconder as no harm could be identified. The officer recommendation was then moved.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be granted subject to conditions including:

- **Standard time limit**
- **Materials, including window and doors**
- **Securing high level windows to the southwest elevation**

(d) EAST BERGHOLT

**Application No. B/15/00956/FUL
Paper R65 – Item 3**

Full application - Erection of two-storey detached replacement dwelling (following demolition of existing dwelling); erection of single-storey detached 3 bay garage with attached store building; construction of replacement vehicular access (following stopping up of existing access); change of use of meadowland to domestic garden; and construction of swimming pool, Etheldene, Dazeleys Lane.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be granted subject to conditions including:

- **Standard time limit;**
- **Standard list of approved plans and documents;**
- **Those required by the local highway authority;**
- **Samples of external facing and roofing materials;**
- **Samples of external colour finishes to be applied;**
- **Large scale drawings of all new external windows and doors;**
- **Landscaping and aftercare;**
- **Precise details of any external lighting to be provided;**
- **Removal of 'permitted development rights' for extension and alteration to the approved buildings and for the provisions of gates, walls, fences and outbuildings.**

(e) LITTLE CORNARD

Application No. B/15/01379/FUL
[Paper R65 – Item 4](#)

Full application - Erection of replacement dwelling and associated works, including improvements to existing vehicular accesses, Kedington Gate, Bures Road.

The Case Officer in presenting the application informed Members that the only objection received had been subsequently withdrawn and that the Parish Council had confirmed that it had no objections to the application.

Notwithstanding the recommendation of the Corporate Manager – Development Management that planning permission be refused for reasons relating to an adverse impact of the replacement dwelling on the surrounding countryside, and the retention and conversion of a significant part of the existing dwelling to a large outbuilding, which would exacerbate the amount of built form in a prominent location, a motion to grant planning permission was moved, and carried on being put to the vote. The motion for approval was on the basis that the proposed replacement dwelling would not have a significant adverse impact on the surrounding countryside by reason of its scale and siting, and that the proposed development would improve the site appearance and street view. The proposal was therefore considered to be appropriate for the plot and its locality and not contrary to Policies CN01, HS05 and CR04.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be granted subject to appropriate conditions.

(f) WOOLVERSTONE

Application No. B/14/00703/FUL
[Paper R65 – Item 2](#)

Full application - Erection of 4 dwellings, garages and associated works, Paul Double Nurseries Ltd, Main Road.

The Case Officer referred to the Addendum to Paper R65 which gave the correct details for the applicant, who was Mr G Braithwaite and not Ingleton Properties as stated in the report.

RESOLVED

(1) That the Corporate Manager – Development Manager be authorised to secure a Planning Obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to provide for:-

- **A financial contribution for off-site affordable housing;**
- **Secure conversion works to the water tower prior to the development of the dwellings;**

- The tying of the walled garden and associated structures and their maintenance, to Plot 11 and preventing the sale or lease of the walled garden separate to Plot 11;
 - The preclusion of any sub-division of the walled garden;
 - To ensure appropriate phasing of development;
 - To ensure that plots 10 and plot 11 of planning permission B/08/01067 cannot be built in conjunction with the new dwellings.
- (2) That, subject to the completion of the Planning Obligation referred to in Resolution (1) above to the satisfaction of the Corporate Manager - Development Management, the Corporate Manager - Development Management be authorised to grant planning permission subject to conditions including:
- Standard Time Limit for Commencement;
 - Materials (including fenestration and finishes);
 - Design details;
 - Landscaping;
 - Details of Boundary Treatments/Screen Walls/Fences;
 - Hard surface treatments;
 - As required by LHA;
 - Contamination;
 - Removal of 'Permitted Development Rights' for extensions, alterations, roof additions, outbuildings, microgeneration and means of enclosure.
- (3) That in the event of the Planning Obligation referred to in Resolution (1) above not being secured, the Corporate Manager – Development Management be authorised to refuse planning permission for the following reasons:
- The applications fail to secure the identified conservation works;
 - The applications fail to make provision for affordable housing;
 - The proposals would not represent an acceptable departure from the provisions of the Local Plan.

At this point, the meeting adjourned at 2.00 p.m. for refreshments. The meeting resumed at 2.20 p.m. when the following Members were present:-

Peter Beer - Chairman

Melanie Barrett
David Busby
Sue Burgoyne
Michael Creffield
Derek Davis
Michael Holt
Adrian Osborne

Lee Parker
Stephen Plumb
Nick Ridley
David Rose
Ray Smith
Stephen Williams

77 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION BY THE COMMITTEE
(continued)

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 R66 be made as follows:-

(g) SPROUGHTON

Application No. B/15/00993/FUL
[Paper R66– Item 1](#)

Hybrid planning application in relation to Outline planning consent (all matters reserved) for 29.7ha of mixed use development, comprising: - the erection of up to 475 dwellings (10.74ha); - 4ha of employment land, to include A3, A4, A5, D1, D2 and Sui Generis use classes; - 1.2ha of land for primary education use; - public open space, including children’s play areas; and, - associated landscaping, sustainable urban drainage systems and highway improvements and Full planning consent for residential development of 11.83ha of the outline application site, comprising: - the erection of 145 dwellings; - public open space and children's play areas (LEAP+); - green infrastructure, hard and soft landscaping, and boundary treatments; - sustainable urban drainage systems and pumping station; - highway improvements; and, - an electricity substation, land to the north and south of Poplar Lane.

Andrew Pearce, Senior Development Management Engineer, Suffolk County Council, together with Tony Williams from the District Valuer’s Office were present to answer questions relating to highway matters and viability issues respectively. In addition to both Corporate Managers for Development Management who were present at the meeting, the Corporate Managers for Spatial Planning Policy and Asset Utilisation were also in attendance.

At the outset of her presentation, the Case Officer drew Members’ attention to the corrections set out in the Addendum to Paper R66 including the amendment to the condition regarding the Travel Plan implementation bond, and the receipt of additional representations.

She reported that Ipswich Borough Council had advised her that the sum of £30K for an ecological assessment was no longer required and that a further representation with regards to adverse implications for traffic congestion and educational facilities had been received from Chattisham and Hintlesham Parish Council after the publication of the Addendum.

During the debate that ensued, some Members were of the opinion that although the development would contribute to providing some affordable housing, the quoted proportion was not sufficient, the overall design of the development would have a detrimental effect on the appearance of the gateway location of the site, the proposed mitigation measures to address issues of traffic congestion and road layout would not be sufficient, and that a development of this scale should be part of a wider strategic masterplan to take account of other potential large developments in the area. Philip Isbell, Corporate Manager – Development Management responded to the concerns raised, with particular reference to the finding of the Local Plan Inspector that there was no need to wait for a strategic masterplan of the type suggested.

Notwithstanding the recommendation of the Corporate Manager – Development Management that planning permission be granted subject to a Section 106 Agreement and conditions as set out in Paper R66, a motion for refusal was moved for reasons relating to the perceived harm referred to during the debate, as outlined above, and being contrary to Policies CS7, CS15, CS18, CS19 and CN01.

A short adjournment followed to enable both Corporate Managers for Development Management and technical and legal officers to consider whether the proposed grounds of refusal were defensible. When the meeting resumed, Members were advised that only the design concerns could be supported as a result of which the vote was taken on an amended motion to refuse planning permission for reasons relating to poor design, contrary to policy.

RESOLVED

That Planning Permission be refused for the following reasons:

- **unacceptable quality of design,**
- **poor quality development for the gateway location of the site,**
- **visual harm as a consequence of unattractive design of flats located at the highest point of the site,**
- **the proposed development is therefore contrary to Policies CS7 CN01 and CS15 (part).**

Note: The meeting adjourned between 11.30 and 11.45 for refreshments.

The business of the meeting was concluded at 4.35 pm.

.....
Chairman