

Confirmed



Minutes of a Meeting of the **Planning Committee South** held in the Deben Conference Room, East Suffolk House, Melton, on **Tuesday, 25 July 2023 at 2.00pm.**

Members of the Committee present:

Councillor Tom Daly, Councillor Mike Deacon, Councillor John Fisher, Councillor Katie Graham, Councillor Colin Hedgley, Councillor Debbie McCallum, Councillor Mike Ninnmey, Councillor Mark Packard, Councillor Rosie Smithson

Other Members present:

Councillor Sally Noble

Officers present:

Nick Clow (Assistant Planner), Matt Makin (Democratic Services Officer (Regulatory)), Agnes Ogundiran (Conservative Political Group Support Officer), Philip Ridley (Head of Planning and Coastal Management), Rachel Smith (Principal Planner), Alli Stone (Democratic Services Officer (Governance)), Dominic Starkey (Assistant Enforcement Officer (Development Management)).

1 Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

No apologies for absence were received.

2 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Mike Deacon declared an Other Registerable Interest in item 7 of the agenda, as a member of Felixstowe Town Council.

3 Declarations of Lobbying and Responses to Lobbying

No declarations of lobbying were made.

4 Minutes

Councillor Fisher noted a typographical error in the second paragraph of the minutes and noted that Councillor Hedgley had declared an interest in item 6 of the agenda and not item 8 of the agenda as recorded.

On the proposition of Councillor Fisher, seconded by Councillor Hedgley, it was by a unanimous vote

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting held on 27 June 2023 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair, subject to the following amendment:

Item 2, paragraph 2 "Councillor Colin Hedgley declared a Non-Registerable Interest in item 6 of the agenda, as the application site was located within his ward."

5 East Suffolk Enforcement Action - Case Update

The Committee received report **ES/1612** of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, which provided a summary of the status of all outstanding enforcement cases for East Suffolk Council where enforcement action had been sanctioned under delegated powers up until 26 June 2023. At that time there were 17 such cases.

The report was taken as read and the Chair invited the Assistant Enforcement Officer (Development Management) to comment on it. The Assistant Enforcement Officer highlighted that for cases B1 (Land at Wangford Road/Reydon Lane, Reydon) and B3 (26 Highland Drive, Worlingham) appeal dates for site visits in August 2023 had been confirmed. The Committee was advised that in case F2 (Land adjacent to Oak Spring, The Street, Darsham) the appeal against enforcement action had been dismissed and a compliance date of 24 July 2023 had been set.

The Chair invited questions and comments to the officers. Councillor Hedgley commended the team for its work, noting the length of time taken on several cases.

On the proposition of Councillor Hedgley, seconded by Councillor Fisher, it was by a unanimous vote

RESOLVED

That the outstanding enforcement matters up to 26 June 2023 be noted.

6 DC/22/4985/FUL - Hungarian Lodge, High Street, Ufford, IP13 6EL

The Committee received report **ES/1613** of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, which related to planning application DC/22/4985/FUL.

The application sought full planning permission for the erection of one dwelling on land at Hungarian Lodge, High Street, Ufford. As the case officer's minded-to recommendation of approval was contrary to the recommendation of refusal received from Ufford Parish Council the application was considered by the Planning Referral Panel on 4 July 2023, in accordance with the scheme of delegation set out in the East Suffolk Council Constitution. The Planning Referral Panel was of the view that the significant planning considerations and public interest were such that the application should be determined by the Committee.

The Committee received a presentation from the Principal Planner, who was the case officer for the application. The Principal Planner summarised the evolution of the application, noting that originally a two-storey dwelling had been proposed; the scheme had been amended in response to comments received to form the proposal that was before the Committee.

The site's location was outlined and the Committee was shown photographs demonstrating the following views:

- looking into the application site
- towards the application site from the south
- towards the application site from the north
- towards the host dwelling from Lodge Road
- looking into the site from the access point
- properties in Lodge Road with gardens bordering High Street
- towards 11 Lodge Road from within the application site
- from the access point into the site, showing the relationship with 11 Lodge Road
- looking east to west across the application site

When displaying the photographs, the Principal Planner outlined the fenestration arrangements of 11 Lodge Road facing the proposed development and highlighted that the window that would be most affected served the property's dining room.

The Committee was shown the proposed layout, elevations and floor plans. The Principal Planner displayed the proposed sections and demonstrated the development's relationship to 11 Lodge Road.

The material planning considerations and key issues were summarised as the principle of development, design and appearance, and the impact on neighbours' residential amenity, particularly in regard to light.

The Principal Planner provided an overview of the impact on light to 11 Lodge Road. The Committee was advised that all windows with a requirement for daylight had passed the Vertical Sky Component test with the exception of the dining room window.

The Principal Planner explained that where existing buildings sat close to the boundary, alternative targets can be applied by calculating the level of light that the window would achieve if obstructed by a hypothetical 'mirror image' of the existing building; the dining room window passed the Vertical Sky Component test using this target and the Principal Planner highlighted that similar applies to the daylight distribution target.

The recommendation to approve the application, as set out in the report, was outlined to the Committee.

The Chair invited questions to the officers. The Principal Planner confirmed the Councillor Deacon that Ufford Parish Council had not objected to the original two-storey development proposal.

Councillor Hedgley queried the distance of the proposed dwelling from the site boundary. The Principal Planner said the bungalow would be located one metre from the shared boundary with 11 Lodge Road. Councillor Daly queried the distance from the windows of 11 Lodge Road; the Principal Planner explained that the windows affected at 11 Lodge Road were a further two metres away from the shared boundary.

Councillor Ninnmey asked what the increase in footprint had been as a result of the variations made to the application. The Principal Planner was not aware of the precise measurements but was able to display layout drawings demonstrating the change in footprint over the evolution of the application. The Principal Planner confirmed to Councillor Ninnmey that the chimney was for decorative purposes.

The Chair invited Mr Leigh, who objected to the application, to address the Committee. Mr Leigh said he was representing his mother, whose home neighboured the site and who also objected to the application. Mr Leigh said he strongly objected to the application on several grounds; he considered the design failed to respond to the local vernacular and was generic, and sat poorly in relation to neighbouring properties.

Mr Leigh was of the view that the proposed development did not enhance the special architectural character of the area, noting that several listed buildings neighboured the site, and the design was not sympathetic to these buildings. Mr Leigh said that a lack of unified treatment for the façade was a further indication that the development did not fit in to its surroundings.

Mr Leigh said that the development would also have an ecological impact and would remove important habitat. Mr Leigh also pointed out that the close proximity of the bungalow to the shared boundary with 11 Lodge Road was further evidence of the applicant's lack of consideration and would cause an unacceptable level of impact on the light enjoyed by that property.

Mr Leigh said the application was not BRE compliant and said the case officer's justification through alternative testing was erroneous; he said he taken expert advice that suggested such alternative testing was for urban high-rise areas and not applicable to low-rise rural development. Mr Leigh urged the Committee to consider the dangerous precedent accepting this testing would set and, for the reasons he had set out, to refuse the application.

The Chair invited questions to Mr Leigh. Mr Leigh confirmed that the existing habitat that would be lost was not public open space but would represent a further loss of green space in Ufford.

Mr Leigh was asked about the distances between the development, the shared boundary of 11 Lodge Road, and the windows of the existing property. Mr Leigh said he did not have the measurements to hand and referred to those provided by the Principal Planner in her presentation.

The Chair invited Councillor Smith, representing Ufford Parish Council, to address the Committee. Councillor Smith said that the Parish Council objected to the application for several reasons; he noted the applicant occupies a large plot and yet had placed the proposed dwelling very close to 11 Lodge Road in such a way that would cause overlooking, and noted the loss of light identified by the light assessment undertaken. Councillor Smith considered that it would be a more sensible use of the site to relocate the dwelling further from 11 Lodge Road and create more privacy for both properties.

Councillor Smith highlighted the case officer's assertion in the report that the impact on residential amenity was not significant enough to warrant refusal; he suggested otherwise and considered the impact the dwelling would have on 11 Lodge Road had been

underestimated. Councillor Smith noted that the application site was of a higher ground level than 11 Lodge Road.

Councillor Smith said the Parish Council supported the objections made by residents and noted that the site formed an open ecological corridor that would be lost. Councillor Smith was of the view that the applicant had not adhered to pre-application advice about making the design being in keeping with the streetscene and reiterated that several listed buildings neighboured the application site.

Councillor Smith submitted that that the proposed dwelling would have a significant impact on the streetscene and that the case officer should have insisted on a streetscene drawing being submitted. Councillor Smith noted that the Highways Authority had originally objected to the application before moving to recommending approval subject to conditions, and that there had been no consultation with neighbours. Councillor Smith encouraged the Committee to refuse the application for the reasons he had set out.

The Chair invited questions to Councillor Smith. In response to a query from Councillor Deacon regarding the Parish Council's comments on the first iteration of the application, Councillor Smith said this was a consequence of timing and that the Parish Council had been given a very limited period to consider the first application; he said it was a matter of record in the Parish Council minutes that some councillors had raised objections with the original application.

Councillor Smith confirmed to Councillor Hedgley that there had been no consultation undertaken by the applicant. Councillor Smith advised Councillor Ninnmey that whilst he did not have precise information on the biodiversity loss to hand, the draft Ufford Neighbourhood Plan had identified the site as part of an existing ecological corridor and that adjacent developments had cited this as important to offsetting their own ecological impact.

The Chair invited Mr Jones, the applicant's agent, to address the Committee. Mr Jones noted he was a right to light surveyor for the applicant and made a presentation on the results of the BRE surveys completed. Mr Jones highlighted specifically the results relating to the dining room window of 11 Lodge Road and that it had marginally failed the two-prong Vertical Sky Component test on both loss and ratio, with similar results for the daylight distribution test.

Mr Jones outlined the alternative test using a hypothetical 'mirror image' of the existing building as detailed by the Principal Planner in her presentation and summarised that it could be the case that the dining room window takes its fair share of the light.

The Chair invited questions to Mr Jones. In response to a query from Councillor McCallum, Mr Jones reiterated the explanation of the alternative test given by the Principal Planner earlier in the meeting. When asked by Councillor Daly for comment about Mr Leigh's observation that the alternative test should not be applied in a low-rise and rural area, Mr Jones challenged this notion and explained that the test was self-regulating and created its own targets and could be applied to rural, urban and suburban areas.

The Chair invited the Head of Planning and Coastal Management to comment on issues relating to light. The Head of Planning and Coastal Management explained that the impact on light to 11 Lodge Road was one factor to be considered as part of considering the relationship between the proposed dwelling and the neighbouring property.

The Committee was advised that the figures provided by Mr Jones needed to be balanced against other factors when determining the application and highlighted the change of height between the two sites. The Head of Planning and Coastal Management advised that if the Committee needed further understanding of the possible loss of light issue, it could defer its decision to allow for a site visit to take place.

The Chair invited Councillor Noble, the ward member for Ufford, to address the Committee. Councillor Noble endorsed the comments of Mr Leigh and Ufford Parish Council and said she had received feedback from the residents that they had struggled to find the elevations in the application documents and that the submitted drawings were not clear or well labelled.

Councillor Noble highlighted that the applicant had not submitted a design and access statement and no comments had been received from the Council's Design and Conservation team; she pointed out that the proposed dwelling was very close to 11 Lodge Road and there was no indication of the proposed boundary treatments. Councillor Noble said that Google Maps images suggested large trees on the site had already been felled and there was very little space for replanting or softening the boundary with 11 Lodge Road.

Councillor Noble said it was regrettable that there had not been a site visit and considered that the proposed dwelling would not benefit Ufford and would have a negative impact on biodiversity.

The Chair invited questions to Councillor Noble. Councillor Ninnmey asked if the site had been detailed in the work to draft the Ufford Neighbourhood Plan and Councillor Noble said she was not fully aware.

Councillor Smithson queried if there would be the same level of objection if the design was more appropriate to the area. Councillor Noble replied that the proximity of the proposed dwelling to 11 Lodge Road was a significant component of objections, which were not solely based on the design.

The Chair invited the Committee to debate the application that was before it. Councillor McCallum proposed that, given the issues around light and the objections received, the application be deferred to enable the Committee to visit the application site; this was seconded by Councillor Hedgley.

Councillor Deacon concurred that a site visit was required given the complexities of the application and considered it would be helpful to do so.

There being no further debate the recommendation to defer the application to enable the Committee to visit the site was put to the vote and it was unanimously

RESOLVED

That the application be **DEFERRED** to enable the Committee to visit the application site.

Officers advised that a site visit would be arranged and that details would be circulated to members of the Committee in due course.

7 DC/23/1294/FUL - 19 Penfold Road, Felixstowe, IP11 7BP

The Committee received report **ES/1614** of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, which related to planning application DC/23/1294/FUL.

The application sought full planning permission for the construction of a two-storey side extension at 19 Penfold Road, Felixstowe. As the case officer's "minded to" recommendation of approval was contrary to the recommendation of refusal received from Felixstowe Town Council the application was considered by the Planning Referral Panel on 11 July 2023, in accordance with the scheme of delegation set out in the East Suffolk Council Constitution.

As the Panel was split on the route of determination the application was referred to the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, who decided that the application should be determined by the Committee due to the potential impact on 17 Penfold Road, the streetscene, and bin storage/parking provision.

The Committee received a presentation from the Assistant Planner, who was the case officer for the application. The site's location was outlined and the Committee was shown aerial photographs of the site demonstrating how the site fitted in with the surrounding streetscene.

The Assistant Planner displayed photographs demonstrating various views into the site and along the streetscene.

The existing and proposed block plan, elevations and floor plans were displayed. The Committee was advised that in respect of the amount of off-road parking provided, officers were content with two spaces as the host dwelling could be extended under permitted development rights with no regard to the Parking Standards.

The Assistant Planner outlined the light testing undertaken in respect of 17 Penfold Road, which related to a window servicing the kitchen of that property.

The Committee was apprised of the details of a similar scheme on the site consented in 2014; the Assistant Planner said the previously approved scheme did not extend as far to the rear of the host dwelling as the current proposal, but was otherwise similar.

The Committee was shown photographs demonstrating similar extension permitted in the immediate area.

The recommendation to approve the application, as set out in the report, was outlined to the Committee.

The Chair invited questions to the officers. In response to a query from Councillor Daly, the Assistant Planner clarified that the current Parking Standards required the host dwelling to have two off-road parking space and the proposed extension would increase this requirement to three spaces. Officers were content with two off-road spaces provided in this instance given that the extension of the house under permitted development rights could occur with no recourse given to the Parking Standards.

The Assistant Planner confirmed to Councillor Smithson that no objections had been received from neighbouring properties. When asked by Councillor McCallum, the Assistant Planner advised that although the example extensions displayed were not identical to the proposed extension they were broadly similar.

Councillor Graham queried if the roof lighting proposed was necessary, noting the impact they could have on light pollution and having regard to information on dark skies she had received at a recent AONB meeting. The Assistant Planner explained that this would not be a material planning consideration and noted the established precedent for similar roof lighting in Penfold Road. The Head of Planning and Coastal Management added that the AONB standards referred to would not apply to the area the application site lay within and the proposed lighting would have a negligible impact on light pollution in an urban area.

The Assistant Planner confirmed to Councillor Deacon that the inclusion of the Juliet balcony was not considered to impact on the visual amenity or character of the area.

The Chair invited Mr Saiz, the applicant, to address the Committee. Mr Saiz noted that his family had lived on Penfold Road for some time and liked the area and required the extension for additional living and working space, which they had realised during the pandemic they needed.

Mr Saiz confirmed that no objections had been received from neighbours and that he had discussed the application with the residents of 17 Penfold Road, discovering there was a second window servicing their kitchen which would not be impacted by the development. Mr Saiz highlighted that the light reaching the affected kitchen window at 17 Penfold Road was already minimal.

Mr Saiz highlighted other developments consented in the area that had created a degree of overlooking and said it would be unusual to refuse his application for similar reasons.

The Chair invited questions to Mr Saiz. In response to Councillor Daly's question on parking, Mr Saiz said the parking arrangements would be unchanged and did not envisage any parking issues following development. Mr Saiz noted that other dwellings in the area did not utilise their off-road parking provision.

The Chair invited the Committee to debate the application that was before it. Councillor Hedgley noted that there had been no objections from neighbours despite a consultation taking place; he was in support of the application.

Councillor McCallum proposed the recommendation to approve the application, which was seconded by Councillor Deacon, and on being put to the vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED

That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun within a period of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be completed in all respects strictly in accordance with drawing number 64241 Rev A received on the 28.03.2023, for which permission is hereby granted or which are subsequently submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and in compliance with any conditions imposed by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt as to what has been considered and approved.

3. The materials and finishes shall be as indicated within the submitted application and thereafter retained as such, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development in the interests of visual amenity

Informative:

The Local Planning Authority has assessed the proposal against all material considerations including planning policies and any comments that may have been received. The planning application has been approved in accordance with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and local plan to promote the delivery of sustainable development and to approach decision taking in a positive way.

8 DC/23/0517/FUL - 39 Simons Cross, Wickham Market, Woodbridge, IP13 0SX

The Committee received report **ES/1615** of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, which related to planning application DC/23/0517/FUL.

The application sought full planning permission for the erection of a holiday let at 39 Simons Cross, Wickham Market. As the case officer's "minded to" recommendation of approval was contrary to the recommendation of refusal received from Wickham Market Parish Council the application was considered by the Planning Referral Panel on 2 May 2023, in accordance with the scheme of delegation set out in the East Suffolk Council Constitution, who referred the application to the Committee for determination.

The Committee received a presentation from the Assistant Planner, who was the case officer for the application. The site's location was outlined and the Committee was shown aerial photographs demonstrating the site's relationship to the streetscene. The Committee also received photographs demonstrating views of the site from various angles in Simons Cross.

The Assistant Planner displayed the existing and proposed block plans, elevations and floor plans, noting the addition of a secure bin and bicycle storage following comments received at the Planning Referral Panel.

The Committee was shown photographs of the site demonstrating the existing parking arrangements; the host dwelling was currently served by three off-road parking spaces and this would be maintained following the development. The Assistant Planner highlighted this met the Parking Standards required by the Highways Authority.

The recommendation to approve the application, as set out in the report, was outlined to the Committee.

The Chair invited questions to the officers; he asked for clarification on the concerns of Wickham Market Parish Council about the letting of the of the development. The Assistant Planner explained that there was a proposed condition to restrict use to holiday let only, to prevent the sale of the extension as a separate dwelling.

The Chair invited Mr Austin, the applicant, to address the Committee. Mr Austin said he was looking to convert his garage and had also completed a change of use application to use it as a holiday let. Mr Austin said he had been upfront and honest with his neighbours, consulting them at the outset.

Mr Austin had said his original intention was to create space for relatives to use when visiting, and the holiday let element was to recuperate his costs. Mr Austin did not envisage heavy use of the development as a holiday let but said he would be promoting local businesses to any guests, which he considered would be good for the area.

Mr Austin advised that his family only had one car and given there was space to park behind and in front of the garage, the property would be served by four off-road parking spaces. Mr Austin understood that the development would be restricted in order to not be used as a separate dwelling.

The Chair invited questions to Mr Austin. In response to a query from Councillor Hedgley, Mr Austin said he was aware and content that he would be liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) payments.

The Chair invited Councillor Noble, the ward member for Wickham Market, to address the Committee. Councillor Noble highlighted that Wickham Market Parish Council was opposed to the use of the development as a holiday let, expressing concerns about parking and noting that there would be space for three vehicles.

Councillor Noble noted adjacent development on the old allotments would bring another 25 dwellings and sought assurances that the development would not become a separate dwelling.

There being no questions to Councillor Noble, the Chair invited the Committee to debate the application that was before it. Councillor McCallum noted the increase in her own ward of the area being used as a base for people visiting and exploring East Suffolk and saw no reason to object to the application, considering it would benefit tourism in the area. Councillor Deacon concurred with these comments, noting the application was policy compliant and would be good for the economy.

There being no further debate the Chair sought a proposer and seconder for the recommendation to approve the application, set out in the report. On the proposition of Councillor Deacon, seconded by Councillor Smithson it was by a unanimous vote

RESOLVED

That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun within a period of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be completed in all respects strictly in accordance with Drawing number PP001C received on the 29.06.2023, for which permission is hereby granted or which are subsequently submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and in compliance with any conditions imposed by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt as to what has been considered and approved.

3. The materials and finishes shall be as indicated within the submitted application and thereafter retained as such, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development in the interests of visual amenity

4. The premises herein referred to shall be used for holiday letting accommodation and for no other purpose (including any other purpose in Class C3 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended)).

When the unit is in use as a 'holiday let', the duration of occupation by any one person, or persons, of the unit shall not exceed a period of 56 days in total in any one calendar year. The owners/operators of the holiday unit hereby permitted shall maintain an up-to-date Register of all lettings, which shall include the names and addresses of all those persons occupying the unit during each individual letting. The said register shall be made available at all reasonable times to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: The development is not such that the local planning authority would be prepared to approve as a separate dwellinghouse in its own right. This condition is imposed to ensure that the development is occupied only as bona-fide holiday accommodation in the interests of residential amenity.

5. The parking spaces in front of existing dwellinghouse and the hereby consented holiday let, shall be retained for parking purposes and be maintained for use by both the dwellinghouse and the holiday let in perpetuity.

Reason: To ensure that adequate shared parking provision is maintained for both the dwellinghouse and the holiday let in the interests of highway safety, whilst maintaining flexibility in terms of which occupants can utilise which parking space, due to the close relationship between the use of the units.

Informatives:

1. The Local Planning Authority has assessed the proposal against all material considerations including planning policies and any comments that may have been received. The planning application has been approved in accordance with the objectives of the National Planning Policy

Framework and local plan to promote the delivery of sustainable development and to approach decision taking in a positive way.

2. East Suffolk Council is a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Authority.

The proposed development referred to in this planning permission may be chargeable development liable to pay Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) under Part 11 of the Planning Act 2008 and the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended).

If your development is for the erection of a new building, annex or extension or the change of use of a building over 100sqm in internal area or the creation of a new dwelling, holiday let of any size or convenience retail, your development may be liable to pay CIL and you must submit a CIL Form 2 (Assumption of Liability) and CIL Form 1 (CIL Questions) form as soon as possible to CIL@eastsoffolk.gov.uk.

A CIL commencement Notice (CIL Form 6) must be submitted at least 24 hours prior to the commencement date. The consequences of not submitting CIL Forms can result in the loss of payment by instalments, surcharges and other CIL enforcement action.

CIL forms can be downloaded direct from the planning portal: https://www.planningportal.co.uk/info/200136/policy_and_legislation/70/community_infrastructure_levy/5.

Guidance is viewable at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/community-infrastructure-levy>.

9 DC/23/0718/FUL - Sports Ground, Notcutts Park, Fynn Road, Woodbridge, IP12 4LS

The Committee received report **ES/1616** of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, which related to planning application DC/23/0718/FUL.

The application sought full planning permission for the construction of two single-storey extensions to the existing clubhouse at Notcutts Park, Fynn Road, Woodbridge. As the Council had a leasehold on the site the application was presented to the Committee for determination in accordance with the scheme of delegation set out in the East Suffolk Council Constitution.

The Committee received a presentation from the Assistant Planner, who was the case officer for the application. The site's location was outlined and the Committee was advised that following a community governance review the site was now within the Woodbridge parish boundary, having previously been within the Martlesham parish boundary. The site continued to sit within the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan area.

The Committee was shown aerial photographs of the site along with images of the clubhouse on the site from various angles. The Assistant Planner displayed the existing and proposed block plan, floor plans, and elevations.

The recommendation to delegate authority to approve the application to the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, as set out in the report, was outlined to the Committee.

There being no questions to the officers, public speaking or debate, the Chair proposed the recommendation to delegate authority to the Head of Planning and Coastal Management to

approve the application as set out in the report, which was seconded by Councillor Daly and on being put to the vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED

That **AUTHORITY TO APPROVE** the application be delegated to the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, subject to both agreement with the Chair and Vice Chair of Planning Committee South following receipt of the Town Council's comments or following the expiry of the consultation period in the event that no comments are received, and the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun within a period of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be completed in all respects strictly in accordance with Drawing numbers 6423 1, 6423 2, received on the 24.02.2023, for which permission is hereby granted or which are subsequently submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and in compliance with any conditions imposed by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt as to what has been considered and approved.

3. The materials and finishes shall be as indicated within the submitted application and thereafter retained as such, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development in the interests of visual amenity.

Informatives:

1. The Local Planning Authority has assessed the proposal against all material considerations including planning policies and any comments that may have been received. The planning application has been approved in accordance with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and local plan to promote the delivery of sustainable development and to approach decision taking in a positive way.

2. East Suffolk Council is a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Authority.

The proposed development referred to in this planning permission may be chargeable development liable to pay Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) under Part 11 of the Planning Act 2008 and the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended).

If your development is for the erection of a new building, annex or extension or the change of use of a building over 100sqm in internal area or the creation of a new dwelling, holiday let of any size or convenience retail, your development may be liable to pay CIL and you must submit a CIL Form 2 (Assumption of Liability) and CIL Form 1 (CIL Questions) form as soon as possible to CIL@eastsoffolk.gov.uk.

A CIL commencement Notice (CIL Form 6) must be submitted at least 24 hours prior to the commencement date. The consequences of not submitting CIL Forms can result in the loss of payment by instalments, surcharges and other CIL enforcement action.

CIL forms can be downloaded direct from the planning portal: https://www.planningportal.co.uk/info/200136/policy_and_legislation/70/community_infrastructure_levy/5.

Guidance is viewable at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/community-infrastructure-levy>.

The meeting concluded at 3.23pm.

.....
Chair