

**Unconfirmed**



Minutes of a Meeting of the **Planning Committee South** held in the Deben Conference Room, East Suffolk House, Melton, on **Tuesday, 27 February 2024 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 Mark Packard, Councillor Rosie Smithson

**Other Members present:**

Councillor Lee Reeves

**Officers present:**

Eleanor Attwood (Planner), Ellie DeGory (Assistant Planner), Marianna Hall (Principal Planner (Development Management, South Area Lead)), Jack Hannan (Assistant Planner (Major Sites and Condition Monitoring)), Matt Makin (Democratic Services Officer (Regulatory)), James Meyer (Principal Ecologist), Danielle Miller (Principal Planner (Major Sites)), Agnes Ogundiran (Conservative Political Group Support Officer), Rachel Smith (Principal Planner (Development Management, Central Area Lead)), Becky Taylor (Assistant Planner), Ben Woolnough (Planning Manager (Development Management, Major Sites and Infrastructure))

---

**1 Apologies for Absence and Substitutions**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Mike Ninnmey. Councillor Lee Reeves attended the meeting as Councillor Ninnmey's substitute.

**2 Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Colin Hedgley declared a Non-Registerable Interest in the planning application being considered at item 6 of the agenda as the application site was located within his ward.

Councillor Debbie McCallum declared a Non-Registerable Interest in the planning application being considered at item 7 of the agenda as she had provided funding to AFC Kesgrave via her Enabling Communities Budget.

**3 Declarations of Lobbying and Responses to Lobbying**

Councillors Colin Hedgley and Debbie McCallum declared that they had been lobbied by email on the planning application being considered at item 8 of the agenda and had not responded to the correspondence.

Councillors Mike Deacon and Katie Graham declared that they had been lobbied by email on the planning application being considered at item 8 of the agenda and had only responded to acknowledge receipt of the correspondence.

#### **4 Minutes**

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

#### **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 23 January 2024 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

#### **5 East Suffolk Enforcement Action - Case Update**

The Committee received report **ES/1861** 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 25 January 2024. At that time there were 16 such cases.

The Chair invited the Planning Manager (Development Management, Major Sites and Infrastructure) to comment on the report. The Planning Manager had no updates to provide and invited questions from Members.

In response to a question in respect of enforcement case B.5 (Land at Garage Block North of 2 Chepstow Road, Felixstowe), the Planning Manager confirmed that an enforcement notice was served in August 2023 and a subsequent appeal was submitted in October 2023; the Committee was advised that a start date from the Planning Inspectorate was pending and the Planning Manager highlighted the current delays with cases being allocated to planning inspectors.

On the proposition of Councillor McCallum, seconded by Councillor Reeves, it was by a unanimous vote

#### **RESOLVED**

That the outstanding enforcement matters up to 25 January 2024 be noted.

#### **6 DC/22/3748/FUL - Land off Keightley Way, Tuddenham St Martin**

The Committee received report **ES/1862** of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, which related to planning application DC/22/3748/FUL. The application sought full planning permission for 25 dwellings on a site allocated within the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan (the Local Plan) in Tuddenham St Martin for approximately 25 dwellings.

The application had been presented to the Committee for determination at the request of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, in accordance with the scheme of delegation set out in the East Suffolk Council Constitution, due to the significant interest from members of the public, Tuddenham St Martin Parish Council, a neighbouring Parish Council, and a ward member.

The application was first considered by the Committee at its meeting on 23 January 2024, where it was resolved to defer the application's determination to enable members of the Committee to carry out a site visit; this visit took place on 27 February 2024 prior to the Committee meeting.

The Committee received a presentation from the Principal Planner (Development Management, Central Area Lead), who was the case officer for the application. The Committee's attention was drawn to the update sheet, which had been published on 26 February 2024, regarding further third-party representations received following the publication of the committee report.

The site's location was outlined, and the Principal Planner recapped the village profile of Tuddenham St Martin that had been presented at the meeting on 23 January 2024. The Principal Planner noted the third-party comments on the profile's accuracy and clarified that 'major' development had been classified as 10 or more dwellings for the purpose of the profile. The Committee was advised that other comments on accuracy related to census data.

The Committee was shown photographs of the site demonstrating views looking from The Street towards Keightley Way (one of which demonstrated the section of highway with no footpath), along Keightley Way, looking into the site from the access point, and looking across the site from the northern boundary.

The proposed site layout plan was displayed and the Committee was shown the elevations for the various types of dwellings proposed on the site. The Principal Planner outlined the housing mix plan, demonstrating the proposed location for affordable housing units, and summarised the materials plan.

The material planning considerations and key issues were summarised as the principle of development, the compliance with the requirements of the Local Plan policy allocating the site for development, design, layout and landscaping, surface water drainage strategy, and highways.

The Principal Planner outlined a potential draft Section 106 Agreement wording seeking to secure pedestrian improvements and the location of a proposed new public right of way developed alongside Suffolk County Council.

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

The Chair invited questions to the officers. In response to questions from Members, officers confirmed the following:

- There would be a surfaced path connecting the development to the existing play area adjacent to the site, with bollards to prevent vehicular access.
- That there were proposed conditions to secure the recommendations of the Council's ecologist in respect of ecological enhancement on the site.
- The process and powers to create a new public right of way, should the Section 106 Agreement be secured.
- That the existing public right of way would not be surfaced.
- The formulation of the figure of £100,000 quoted as required for pedestrian improvements.
- That the existing play area was under the control of Tuddenham St Martin Parish Council.

A member of the Committee queried if the new public right of way could be secured via planning condition. The Planning Manager (Development Management, Major Sites and Infrastructure) explained that as the proposed site for the right of way was third-party land, and the public right of way was not deemed essential for the delivery of the site, the right of way could only be secured as an obligation for funding and a covenant on the District or County Council to pursue a right of way creation agreement or order.

The Member queried if officers considered the proposed right of way was in fact necessary to deliver the site. The Planning Manager acknowledged the concerns raised about pedestrian connectivity between the site and the wider village but stated that the allocation policy in the Local Plan did not require a new footpath to be constructed and it was this policy which informed what could and could not be imposed on any proposed development.

Another member of the Committee referred to paragraph 6.39 of the committee report and stated that only £8,000 appeared to have been secured for pedestrian improvements, querying where the remaining required funds would come from. The Principal Planner advised that paragraph 6.39 referred to the RAMS contribution, which was not relevant to pedestrian improvements, and the Planning Manager advised that the £100,000 required for pedestrian improvements would be secured via a Section 106 Agreement and would be supported by Community Infrastructure Levy contributions.

When asked by several members of the Committee if the £100,000 for pedestrian improvements were guaranteed, officers reiterated that this would be secured as a maximum amount via a Section 106 Agreement to deliver the proposed public right of way.

A member of the Committee queried if the development could be paused to allow for highways infrastructure to be delivered. The Planning Manager explained that this application was not required to solve any perceived deficiencies that existed in the area and it would not be appropriate to pause the application as it was required to be determined within a set timescale. The Committee was advised that if the application was not determined within this timescale, the applicant would be able to appeal to the Planning Inspectorate on non-determination grounds.

Another member of the Committee asked what the possible consequences might be should the application be refused on highways related matters and the decision appealed to the Planning Inspectorate. The Planning Manager reminded the Committee that it was required to determine the application in accordance with the current development plan and noted that the site was allocated for development in the Local Plan for the number of dwellings proposed. The Planning Manager advised the Committee that officers considered the proposals were policy compliant and that the pedestrian link to the wider village was a complementary issue.

The Chair invited Mr Richard Ward, who objected to the application, to address the Committee. Mr Ward spoke to two slides he had submitted for presentation, summarising residents' material considerations in objection to the application. Mr Ward highlighted concerns relating to safe pedestrian access to the village, access to the play area, parking allocation not being compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) or the Suffolk Technical Guidance, and the proposed site plan.

Mr Ward was of the view that there was still no specific plan to achieve pedestrian access to the site; he noted that officers had concluded that existing routes were acceptable and the Highways Authority had advised the Parish Council that it was not possible to extend pedestrian facilities on The Hill. Mr Ward also queried if £100,000 was sufficient to achieve compliance for pedestrian access.

Mr Ward considered that the accesses and cycle route to the play were speculative and said that multiple accesses was contentious, and unlikely to be agreed by the community. Mr Ward highlighted existing parking issues on Keightley Way and The Hill and said that emergency and delivery vehicles had failed to access the areas in recent times.

Mr Ward said that access to the village was unsafe and summarised that the proposed development did not integrate with existing facilities, give priority to pedestrian access, address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility, minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles, and allow for efficient delivery of goods and access by service and emergency vehicles.

The Chair invited questions to Mr Ward. A member of the Committee asked for further detail on Mr Ward's concerns about multiple accesses to the play area being contentious. Mr Ward cited studies into safety around play areas that demonstrated a single point of access was better for securing child safety and the multiple accesses proposed was contrary to this.

The Member then asked Mr Ward about the community's engagement during the making of the Local Plan. Mr Ward said that despite objections being made at that time, he considered there was no evidence the concerns raised were acknowledged.

The Chair invited Councillor Pauline Procter, representing Tuddenham St Martin Parish Council, to address the Committee. Councillor Procter said that the representations made by the Parish Council at the last meeting remained relevant and stated that, should the application be approved, a condition be added to limit from which direction construction traffic approached the site.

Councillor Procter referred to the correspondence relating to the meetings between the Council and the Highways Authority regarding the proposed public right of way and expressed disappointment that the Parish Council had not been given the opportunity to contribute.

Councillor Procter reiterated the Parish Council's views that it did not consider it impossible to improve the footpath on The Hill and said that the proposed solution of a new public right of way was not fit for purpose as it did not create a main route into the village. Councillor Procter said the Parish Council did not want to see significant funds wasted on such a scheme.

Councillor Procter was of the view that the on-street parking issues had still not been addressed, noting that current parking arrangements on The Hill and Keightley Way were inadequate and the issue would be exacerbated by the development. Councillor Procter said that the Parish Council still favoured additional on-street parking on the site, suggesting it be facilitated by removing one of the proposed dwellings.

Councillor Procter concluded that the proposed development would increase congestion in the village, negatively impact the quiet lane, and was an overdevelopment of the site being parachuted into the village, with the proposed mitigations having little impact.

The Chair invited questions to Councillor Procter. In response to a member of the Committee, Councillor Procter reiterated that the Parish Council considered the proposed public right of way would not resolve the pedestrian connectivity issues and would lead to an existing muddy track that was prone to flooding.

Another member of the Committee asked Councillor Procter what the solution to the issue would be. Councillor Procter repeated her earlier statement that it was not impossible to extend the footpath at The Hill to create a link between the site and the wider village.

A member of the Committee noted a pathway for houses on the corner of The Hill and Keightley Way and suggested this could be linked. Councillor Procter replied that the safety of this path could not be guaranteed and the staircase element of the route would not resolve disabled and reduced mobility access issues.

The Chair invited Mr Elliot Clarke-Gifford, representing the applicant, to address the Committee. Mr Clarke-Gifford hoped that the site visit had provided the Committee with valuable insight; he acknowledged the need to consider the proposed development in the context of the wider village but stressed it was important to note that many of the issues raised were not within the remit of the planning application.

Mr Clarke-Gifford said it was outside of the applicant's control to address the existing highways issues in the village and highlighted that the Highways Authority had not objected to the application. Mr Clarke-Gifford advised the Committee that it was required to determine the application on its merits and was of the view that it met and exceeded the policy requirements and the expectations of all statutory consultees bar Tuddenham St Martin Parish Council.

Mr Clarke-Gifford said that the concerns raised by objectors were valid but beyond the scope of the applicant's responsibility, and considered they were more symptomatic of country living. Mr Clarke-Gifford said it was crucial to recognise that the site was allocated for development in the Local Plan and the application was deemed policy compliant by officers, and urged the Committee to determine the application on its merits.

The Chair invited questions to Mr Clarke-Gifford. When asked by a member of the Committee if the applicant had considered the needs of the community, Mr Clarke-Gifford responded that they had, having submitted the application in accordance with policy and then engaged with the community as part of the application process.

Another member of the Committee queried if the applicant should be addressing the pedestrian connectivity with the wider village, as it appeared to be a fundamental issue for the community. Mr Clarke-Gifford reiterated that the Highways Authority, a statutory technical consultee, had not objected to the application and therefore did not consider the linkage an issue that would prevent the development going ahead. In response to a further question from the Member, Mr Clarke-Gifford said that the applicant would be working with all parties to find a satisfactory solution to the issues raised.

In response to a question regarding the route for construction traffic, Mr Clarke-Gifford explained that this was yet to be confirmed but would be set out in the Construction Management Plan and all information would be made available to ward members and the Parish Council.

A member of the Committee queried the visitor parking arrangements for the completed development. Mr Clarke-Gifford explained that all dwellings exceeded the minimum parking standards and that there would be nine visitor parking spaces across the scheme.

There being no further questions to Mr Clarke-Gifford, the Chair invited the Principal Planner to address the Committee on the Local Plan consultation stage. The Principal Planner advised that a number of other sites in the area had been put forward during the making of the Local Plan, and had been discounted due to poor access. The application site in question had originally been presented for approximately 35 dwellings and was reduced to 25 following objections during the consultation process. The Principal Planner could not recall the Parish Council commenting on the acceptability of a new access into the existing play area at the Local Plan consultation stage.

The Chair invited the Committee to debate the application that was before it. A member of the Committee highlighted the highways concerns raised in respect of the application and identified there was a wish for a proper access strategy being in place before any development took place. The Member acknowledged this was not in the Committee's gift to do and said there was a need to consider the material planning considerations within the existing framework, making the development the best it can be.

The same Member cautioned that should the Committee attempt to solve the wider issues in the village through this application, it could leave the Council vulnerable if the decision was appealed to the Planning Inspectorate.

Several members of the Committee expressed concerns about the application in terms of sustainability and safe pedestrian access. One member of the Committee expressed concerns that the play area access may not be deliverable as presented and said that until the pedestrian safety on The Hill was addressed, he could not support the application. Another member of the Committee queried what powers the Committee had to ask the Highways Authority to revisit the application.

A member of the Committee referred to planning policy in respect to a scale appropriate to the village; he highlighted that Tuddenham St Martin consisted of 175 dwellings, 141 within the settlement boundary, and that the proposed development would increase the housing stock in the village by 17.5%, which he considered to be overdevelopment. The Member also cited policy SCLP7.1 of the Local Plan on sustainable transport and was of the view that the development was contrary to this policy, as it was encouraging car use, and raised concerns about a lack of proper public transport links.

The same Member acknowledged that the site was allocated for development but was of the view that the development was being proposed without any planning for the impact on the existing village or the people who would occupy the new homes.

Another member of the Committee queried if the highways issues could be revisited. The Planning Manager urged caution when considering making significant highways changes as part of the committee decision making and advised that the Committee should determine the application as presented and against the allocation policy, which did not require changes to the highway to deliver the site. The Committee was reminded that the application needed to be judged on its merits and that officers recommended it was compliant with the development plan.

There being no further debate the Chair sought a proposer and seconder for the recommendation to delegate authority to approve the application to the Head of Planning and Coastal Management as set out in the report and including an additional condition to secure the requirement for the access to the play area, as shown on the proposed plans, to be completed before any dwelling is occupied. The recommendation was proposed by Councillor Packard, seconded by Councillor McCallum and by a majority vote **FAILED**.

The Committee sought to formulate an alternative recommendation. Following further debate, a member of the Committee considered that the application should be refused on the grounds that it was contrary to policies SCLP5.2 and SCLP7.1(c)&(d), due to overdevelopment in proportion to the village and highway safety grounds. Other members of the Committee concurred with the view that the application should be refused, but only on highways safety grounds.

The Planning Manager highlighted that the Highways Authority had not raised any objections or concerns to the application on highways safety grounds and stated that should the applicant appeal any refusal, it was unlikely that the Highways Authority



would support the defence of any appeal. In respect of 'overdevelopment' the Planning Manager explained that the application was for 25 homes and the Local Plan allocation was for approximately 25 homes.

The Committee was advised that should it be minded to refuse the application on highways safety grounds, it may be prudent to defer the determination of the application to allow officers to seek third party advice on the safety, integration and connectivity of the proposed development with the existing community. Members were minded to stipulate that should this route be taken, the application must be returned to the Committee for determination.

On the proposition of Councillor McCallum, seconded by Councillor Smithson, it was by a unanimous vote

## **RESOLVED**

That the determination of the application be **DEFERRED** to allow officers to seek third party advice on the safety, integration and connectivity of the proposed development with the existing community, prior to the application being returned to the Committee for determination.

**NOTE:** following the conclusion of this item, the meeting was adjourned between 3.35pm and 3.45pm for a short break. Councillor Daly left the meeting during the adjournment.

## **7 DC/22/2999/FUL - The Hollies, Straight Road, Foxhall, IP10 0FN**

The Committee received report **ES/1863** of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, which related to planning application DC/22/2999/FUL. The application sought to utilise the existing land formerly known as "The Hollies Sports Centre and Social Club" as home pitch locations for both youth and adult football. The creation of a new vehicular access, parking and associated facilities are also proposed within the submission.

The application had been presented to the Committee for determination at the request of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, in accordance with the scheme of delegation set out in the East Suffolk Council Constitution, as in his opinion the application was of significant public interest.

The Committee received a presentation from the Principal Planner (Major Sites), who was the case officer for the application. The site's location was outlined and the Committee was informed of the proximity of the housing development known as "The Hollies", the redevelopment of the former clubhouse site.

An aerial photograph of the site, and stock images of the former use of the site, were displayed to the Committee. The planning history of the site was summarised and it was noted that in an application on the adjacent Trinity Park in 2015, the site was noted on a map as a playing field.

The Committee was shown photographs of the site demonstrating the following views:

- The existing field access
- Looking along Straight Road
- The northern boundary from Bucklesham Road
- A montage of the lower field area (proposed for parking)
- A montage of the upper field area (proposed for pitches)
- The access between the fields
- "The Hollies" housing development as viewed from within the site

The proposed block plan and pedestrian/cycle access were displayed; the Principal Planner explained that the latter was a result of consultation with the Highways Authority. The Committee was also shown a topographical survey of the site overlaid with the proposed visibility splays, noting the partial hedgerow removal required. Images of examples of the proposed office and changing rooms were also displayed.

The Principal Planner provided information provided by AFC Kesgrave demonstrating the potential usage of the site by its 23 teams. The Committee was advised that at present, AFC Kesgrave's teams played at four different venues and did not have its own site. The Principal Planner highlighted that the transport assessment identified 480 vehicle movements on average across the site on a Saturday.

The material planning considerations and key issues were summarised as the principle of development, access and highway safety, residential amenity, landscape setting, and ecology. The recommendation to approve the application, as detailed in the report, was outlined to the Committee.

The Chair invited questions to the officers. A member of the Committee recalled an application to develop the site that was considered by Suffolk Coastal District Council's Planning Committee in 2014, and queried if there had been anything at that time highlighting the wider use of the site for sporting activities. The Principal Planner advised there was no reference to this in the 2014 application on the site but there had been in another application on the site in 2010.

Another member of the Committee asked if the flooding risk had been considered. The Principal Planner said that Suffolk County Council, as the Lead Local Flood Authority, had not raised any concerns during consultation; she added that the parking surface had been designed to ensure appropriate infiltration for surface water. It was confirmed that the pitch drainage would also be via infiltration.

The Chair invited Mr Jack Reason, who objected to the application, to address the Committee. Mr Reason was accompanied by Mr Chris Bruce, who was present to answer any questions from the Committee.

Mr Reason described Straight Road as a single track with few informal passing places. Mr Reason did not consider the proposed access met the national highway standards for visibility due to the height of the road and the surrounding vegetation. Mr Reason was of the view that the applicant had not provided a topographical survey proving how they had resolved this issue. Mr Reason noted there were no footpaths near the site.

Mr Reason said that noise concerns had been raised by so many people that an independent study on the different types of noise that would be generated had been undertaken by objectors, in contrast to what Mr Reason considered to be a simplistic noise assessment submitted by the applicant.

Mr Reason said the proposed development would cause issues for neighbouring residents and stated that a similar scheme had been refused at St Joseph's College, Ipswich. Mr Reason also expressed concern about a lack of details on sewage and drainage, and that one of the proposed conditions would allow for 7-day use of the site. Mr Reason concluded by saying that he was of the opinion that limited rigour had been given to the application and that it fell short of public expectation.

There being no questions to Mr Reason and Mr Bruce, the Chair invited Councillor Graeme Watts, representing Brightwell, Foxhall and Purdis Farm Group Parish Council, to address the Committee. Councillor Watts said it was apparent that the application was a contentious one, given the number of objections it had generated. Councillor Watts said the Group Parish Council supported the objections and expressed disappointment that it had taken so long for the application to come before the Committee, and considered that a number of questions remained unanswered by the officer's report.

Councillor Watts noted the Group Parish Council's previous concerns about traffic on Straight Road and the surrounding area and referenced a traffic assessment commissioned by the Highways Authority, which had concluded that the roads in the area were only suitable for local traffic. Councillor Watts was of the view that the proposed increase in traffic on Straight Road would be dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists using the road.

Councillor Watts advised the Committee that Straight Road was the national speed limit and prone to flooding, and stated that large vehicles would be using the road to access a nearby site. Councillor Watts said the Group Parish Council remained concerned about the impact on wildlife, sewage, and flooding.

Councillor Watts concluded by noting the comments about the former use of the site as a sports club and noted that this use was over 20 years ago, and a lot had changed on the site since then. Councillor Watts urged the Committee to consider the site in its current state and not what it had been before.

There being no questions to Councillor Watts, the Chair invited Mr Dave Collins, representing the applicant, to address the Committee. Mr Collins clarified he was the volunteer chairman of AFC Kesgrave and was representing the applicant, the Suffolk Agricultural Association. Mr Collins read out a short statement from the Chairman of the Suffolk Agricultural Association which outlined the organisations commitment to the application in order to create a dedicated space for AFC Kesgrave and develop a sports area on a community site.

Mr Collins said that AFC Kesgrave was working to create a space to provide a wide range of footballing activities for a variety of teams. The Committee was advised that the club had no current home and played its matches at four different venues, with

varying qualities of playing surface. Mr Collins said the proposed development would provide a good quality site for the club that could be maintained, noting that the club would be under threat if one of its existing venues was no longer available.

Mr Collins said that alternative sites had been considered but had not been viable; he added that sponsorship of the site would also assist the club and urged officers to follow the recommendation to approve the application.

The Chair invited questions to Mr Collins. In response to a member of the Committee, Mr Collins said that AFC Kesgrave would be looking to maintain grass playing surfaces and would be applying for grants to bring the pitches up to standard, which in turn would allow infrastructure on the site to be brought forward.

Another member of the Committee asked if the structures proposed would be permanent or temporary. Mr Collins said they would be modern style portacabin type semi-permanent structures, modular in design.

In response to a question on whether the proposed mental health benefits of the site outweigh the predicted impact on residential amenity, Mr Collins said he was not able to comment on this and said he was viewing the application from the point of view of AFC Kesgrave.

A member of the Committee sought assurances that floodlighting would not be installed, Mr Collins confirmed this would be the case and the site would be used during daylight hours. In response to a follow-up question, Mr Collins said AFC Kesgrave would adhere to any conditions attached to make structures fit in on the site.

The Chair invited the Committee to debate the application that was before it. One member of the Committee spoke at length on the planning history of the site, noting that she had been a member of the Committee that approved "The Hollies" housing development in 2014 and, at that time, had been unhappy about the loss of sporting facilities on the site. The Member said her recollection was that this housing development had been approved on the principle that the remainder of the site would be used for sports facilities.

The same Member noted that the site would not be in constant use and that traffic would be approaching from a variety of directions, highlighting that Straight Road had served a sports facility in the past. The Member was pleased to see AFC Kesgrave investing in the community.

There being no further debate, the Chair sought a proposer and seconder for the recommendation to approve the application as set out in the report. On the proposition of Councillor McCallum, seconded by Councillor Reeves, 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 the following approved plans and documents, 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:

Site location plan 21119 10 (20.11.2023)

Proposed block plan & access detail 21119 11A (20.11.2023)

Pedestrian Access (20.11.2023)

Visibility Splays (20.11.2023)

Design and Access Statement Revision B (20.11.2023); which includes:

- Revised traffic flow numbers from AFC Kesgrave dated 23/08/2023.
- Sharps Redmore report with Technical Note 1 dated 11/10/2023.
- Liz Lord Ecology Report, updated 27/09/2023.
- Stroud Associates Flood Risk and Drainage Strategy updated memo 10/10/2023.
- Flood Risk and Drainage Strategy SW433 (28.11.2022).
- Visibility splays 21119 12A (21.11.2023)
- Office Container floor plan MAC\_CX3209V06 (20.11.2023)
- Changing room plans (20.11.2023)
- Septic Tank details received via email dated (01.02.2023)

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

3. No other part of the development hereby permitted shall be commenced until the new access has been laid out and completed in all respects in accordance with drawing numbers 21119 12A and 21119 11A with an entrance width of 6 metres for a distance of 15 metres measured from the nearside edge of the metalled carriageway.

Thereafter it shall be retained in its approved form.

Reason: To ensure the access is laid out and completed to an acceptable design in the interests of the safety of persons using the access and users of the highway. This needs to be a pre-commencement condition because access for general construction traffic is not otherwise achievable safely.

4. Prior to the development hereby permitted being first used, the new access onto the highway shall be properly surfaced with a bound material for a minimum distance of 15 metres measured from the nearside edge of the metalled carriageway, in accordance with details that shall have previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure construction of a satisfactory access and to avoid unacceptable safety risks arising from materials deposited on the highway from the development.

5. Gates/bollard/chain/other means of obstruction to the access shall be set back a minimum distance of 5 metres from the public highway and shall not open towards the highway.

Reason: To avoid unacceptable safety risks and traffic delay arising from vehicles obstructing the public highway while the obstruction is removed or replaced by enabling vehicles to clear the highway while this is done.

6. Before the access is first used visibility splays shall be provided as shown on drawing no. 21119 12A with an X dimension of 2.4 metres and a Y dimension of 215 metres to the nearside edge of the carriageway and thereafter retained in the specified form. Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2 Part 2 Class A of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification, no obstruction to visibility shall be erected, constructed, planted or permitted to grow over 0.6 metres high within the areas of the visibility splays.

Reason: To ensure drivers of vehicles entering the highway have sufficient visibility to manoeuvre safely including giving way to approaching users of the highway without them having to take avoiding action and to ensure drivers of vehicles on the public highway have sufficient warning of a vehicle emerging in order to take avoiding action, if necessary.

7. The use shall not commence until the area(s) within the site shown on drawing no. 21119 11A for the purposes of loading, unloading, manoeuvring and parking of vehicles has / have been provided and thereafter the area(s) shall be retained, maintained and used for no other purposes.

Reason: To ensure that sufficient areas for vehicles to be parked are provided in accordance with Suffolk Guidance for Parking (2023) where on-street parking and or loading, unloading and manoeuvring would be detrimental to the safe use of the highway.

8. Prior to first operation, an Ecological Enhancement Strategy addressing how ecological enhancements will be achieved on site will be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Ecological enhancement measures should be in accordance with those identified in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) (Liz Lord Ecology, October 2022) and will be delivered and retained in accordance with the approved Strategy.

Reason: To ensure that the development delivers ecological enhancements.

9. A Demolition and Construction Management Strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to work commencing on site. The strategy shall include access and parking arrangements for contractors' vehicles and delivery vehicles (locations and times) and a methodology for avoiding soil from the site tracking onto the highway, together with a strategy for remedy of this should it occur. The development shall only take place in accordance with the approved strategy.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety to avoid the hazard caused by mud on the highway and to ensure minimal adverse impact on the public highway during the

construction phase. This is a pre-commencement condition because an approved Management Strategy must be in place at the outset of the development.

10. Before the development is commenced details of a new footpath to the North West of the site onto the junction of Straight Road and Bucklesham Road shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The footway shall be laid out and constructed to base course before the development is first brought into use. The footway shall be retained thereafter in its approved form.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and sustainable development by providing a footpath at an appropriate time where no provision may deter people from walking. This is a pre-commencement condition because insufficient details have been submitted at planning application stage.

11. No development shall commence until details of the strategy for the disposal of surface water on the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the principles of sustainable drainage are incorporated into this proposal, to ensure that the proposed development can be adequately drained.

12. No development shall commence until details of the implementation, maintenance and management of the strategy for the disposal of surface water on the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall be implemented and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure clear arrangements are in place for ongoing operation and maintenance of the disposal of surface water drainage.

13. Within 28 days of practical completion of the car parking area, a surface water drainage verification report shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority, detailing and verifying that the surface water drainage system has been inspected and has been built and functions in accordance with the approved designs and drawings. The report shall include details of all SuDS components and piped networks in an agreed form, for inclusion on the Lead Local Flood Authority's Flood Risk Asset Register.

Reason: To ensure that the surface water drainage system has been built in accordance with the approved drawings and is fit to be put into operation and to ensure that the Sustainable Drainage System has been implemented as permitted and that all flood risk assets and their owners are recorded onto the LLFA's statutory flood risk asset register as required under s21 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 in order to enable the proper management of flood risk with the county of Suffolk <https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/flooding-and-drainage/flood-risk-asset-register>.

14. No development shall commence until details of a Construction Surface Water Management Plan (CSWMP) detailing how surface water and storm water will be managed on the site during construction (including demolition and site clearance operations) is submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The

CSWMP shall be implemented and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved plan for the duration of construction.

The approved CSWMP shall include:

Method statements, scaled and dimensioned plans and drawings detailing surface water management proposals to include:-

- i. Temporary drainage systems
- ii. Measures for managing pollution / water quality and protecting controlled waters and watercourses
- iii. Measures for managing any on or offsite flood risk associated with construction

Reason: To ensure the development does not cause increased flood risk, or pollution of watercourses or groundwater <https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/flooding-and-drainage/guidance-on-development-and-flood-risk/construction-surface-water-management-plan>.

15. Development must be undertaken in accordance with the ecological avoidance, mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures identified within the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) (Liz Lord Ecology, October 2022, Rev A) and Liz Lord Ecology Report, updated 27/09/2023.

Reason: To ensure that ecological receptors are adequately protected and enhanced as part of the development.

16. No removal of hedgerows, trees or shrubs, brambles, ivy, and other climbing plants, or ground works within the grass fields shall take place between 1st March and 31st August inclusive, unless a competent ecologist has undertaken a careful, detailed check of vegetation for active birds' nests immediately before the vegetation is cleared and provided written confirmation that no birds will be harmed and/or that there are appropriate measures in place to protect nesting bird interest on site. Any such written confirmation shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that nesting birds are protected.

17. No external lighting shall be installed unless a "lighting design strategy for biodiversity" has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall:

- a) identify those areas/features on site that are particularly sensitive for biodiversity likely to be impacted by lighting and that are likely to cause disturbance in or around their breeding sites and resting places or along important routes used to access key areas of their territory, for example, for foraging; and
- b) show how and where external lighting will be installed (through the provision of appropriate lighting contour plans and technical specifications) so that it can be clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent the above species using their territory or having access to their breeding sites and resting places.



All external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and locations set out in the strategy, and these shall be maintained thereafter in accordance with the strategy.

Under no circumstances shall any other external lighting be installed without prior consent from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that impacts on ecological receptors from external lighting are prevented.

18. No development shall take place unless and until:

a) A detailed assessment of ground conditions of the land proposed for the new playing field land as shown on approved drawings has been undertaken (including drainage and topography) to identify constraints which could affect playing field quality; and  
b) Based on the results of this assessment to be carried out pursuant to (a) above of this condition, a detailed scheme to ensure that the playing fields will be provided to an acceptable quality (including appropriate drainage where necessary) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority after consultation with Sport England.

The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme within a timescale to be first approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority after consultation with Sport England.

Reason: To ensure that site surveys are undertaken for new or replacement playing fields and that any ground condition constraints can be and are mitigated to ensure provision of an adequate quality playing field and to accord with Policy SCLP8.2.

19. The playing fields shall be used for Outdoor Sport and for no other purpose (including without limitation any other purpose in Class D2 of the Use Classes Order 2005, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification).

Reason: To protect the playing fields from loss and/or damage, to maintain the quality of and secure the safe use of sports pitches and to accord with Policy SCLP8.2.

20. Prior to the bringing into use of the new playing fields, a Management and Maintenance Scheme for the facility including management responsibilities, a maintenance schedule and a mechanism for review shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority after consultation with Sport England. The measures set out in the approved scheme shall be complied with in full, with effect from commencement of use of the new sports pitches.

Reason: To ensure that the new facilities are capable of being managed and maintained to deliver a facility which is fit for purpose, sustainable and to ensure sufficient benefit of the development to sport (National Planning Policy Framework para. 96) and to accord with Policy SCLP8.2.

21. The facility shall only be open to the public between 9am and 9pm Monday to Saturday, and between 1pm and 5pm on Sundays, and the premises shall be closed to the public at all other times including on Bank Holidays.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and protection of the local environment.

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. It is an OFFENCE to carry out works within the public highway, which includes a Public Right of Way, without the permission of the Highway Authority. Any conditions which involve work within the limits of the public highway do not give the applicant permission to carry them out. Unless otherwise agreed in writing all works within the public highway shall be carried out by the County Council or its agents at the applicant's expense.

The County Council must be contacted on Tel: 0345 606 6171.

For further information go to: <https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/parking/apply-and-pay-for-a-dropped-kerb> or: <https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/planning-waste-and-environment/planning-and-development-advice/application-for-works-licence>.

County Council drawings DM01 - DM14 are available from: <https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/planning-waste-and-environment/planning-and-development-advice/standard-drawings>.

A fee is payable to the Highway Authority for the assessment and inspection of both new vehicular crossing access works and improvements deemed necessary to existing vehicular crossings due to proposed development.

## **8 DC/23/4469/VOC - 32 Thoroughfare, Woodbridge, IP12 1AQ**

The Committee received report **ES/1864** of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, which related to planning application DC/23/4469/VOC. The application was a retrospective one, which sought to retain the dwelling at 32 Thoroughfare, Woodbridge, as constructed and rectify the breaches of conditions 2, 8 and 12 where the approved building had not been built in accordance with the approved plans.

As the case officer's minded-to recommendation to approve the application was contrary to Woodbridge Town Council's recommendation to refuse the application the application was presented to the Planning Referral Panel on 23 January 2024, in accordance with the scheme of delegation set out in the East Suffolk Council Constitution, where it was referred to the Committee for determination.

The Committee received a presentation from the Principal Planner (Major Sites), who was the case officer for the application. The site's location was outlined and the Committee was shown an aerial photograph. The Principal Planner summarised the planning history on the site.

The Committee was shown photographs of the site demonstrating the following views and noting the changes to the approved scheme:

- Changes to the wall at the north-east elevation.
- The north-west and south-east elevations, showing window changes.
- The rear garden as view from within the dwelling.
- Views from the roof terrace.
- Zoomed in view taken from the nearest corner of the roof terrace.
- The side elevation of 6 Doric Place taken from within the site.
- The view from the objector's bathroom window.

When displaying the images, the Principal Planner noted the concerns raised by the objector at 6 Doric Place regarding overlooking into their garden. The Committee's attention was drawn to the maximum zoom image and the Principal Planner highlighted the planting put in place in response to the overlooking.

The Committee received the approved block plan and the approved and proposed elevations. The Principal Planner advised that the Council's Design and Heritage team had been consulted on the changes and was satisfied the development was in keeping with the character of the area and caused no material harm.

The Committee received images taken from the supporting statement showing the view from the roof terrace and images of the garden design of 6 Doric Place, provided by a third party objector.

The Principal Planner displayed the approved landscape plan and stated that, once implemented, the landscaping would separate the view between the application site and 6 Doric Place.

The material planning considerations and key issues were summarised as visual amenity and the impact on the conservation area, and the impact on residential amenity. The recommendation to approve the application, as detailed in the report, was outlined to the Committee.

The Chair invited questions to the officers. The Principal Planner confirmed that the bathroom window at 6 Doric Place was not frosted. When asked by a member of the Committee if the approved scheme had been disregarded, the Planning Manager (Development Management, Major Sites and Infrastructure) said he shared the Member's frustrations but advised that applicants cannot be penalised for being retrospective and must be determined in a fair manner.

The Chair invited Ms Sue Key-Burr, who objected to the application, to address the Committee. Ms Key-Burr said that the flat roof was overbearing and overlooked her garden, giving views of her garden seating area despite the trees planted to screen the view.

Ms Key-Burr said that she had objected to all three previous applications on the site and had compromised on the last application on the grounds that the flat roof would not be used for leisure purposes. Ms Key-Burr highlighted that the applicant had disregarded the approved drawings, defied the Local Planning Authority, and had ignored all compromises made.

Ms Key-Burr added that she had planted the trees screening the view at her own expense, as the applicant had failed to implement the approved landscaping plan, and these trees were now taking up valuable space in her garden.

Ms Key-Burr noted that Woodbridge Town Council's recommendation of refusal concurred with her own objections; she considered that the applicants were seeking to be rewarded for breaking the rules and said she objected to the application in the strongest possible terms, asking the Committee to either refuse the application or visit the site before determining it.

The Chair invited questions to Ms Key-Burr. When asked if the overlooking was her main concern, Ms Key-Burr said although she was concerned about the view into her bathroom window, her chief objection was the overlooking of her entire garden. Another member of the Committee queried if the overlooking would be the same from a Juliet balcony; the Principal Planner said this would still have required planning permission.

The Chair invited Councillor Robin Sanders, representing Woodbridge Town Council, to address the Committee. Councillor Sanders confirmed that the Town Council maintained its objection to the development proposed on the site and said that in all cases this objection related to the overlooking of 6 Doric Place and the impact on residential amenity it would cause.

Councillor Sanders referenced to the Planning Inspector's decision regarding another application on the site and noted their comments on the positions of their photos. Councillor Sanders said the main point of impact was off-site, in the curtilage of 6 Doric Place, and asked if officers had visited the site.

Councillor Sanders said that should the Committee be minded to approve the removal of condition 8, he asked that condition 12 should not be varied to allow three seasons before landscape planting is completed, as a further delay to planting would be to the detriment of the neighbour.

There being no questions to Councillor Sanders, the Chair invited Mrs Groen, the applicant, to address the Committee. Mrs Groen stated that when the Planning Inspector visited the site they did not go up the scaffold to see the view from the built out height. Mrs Groen thanked the case officer for visiting the site.

Mrs Groen said that she and her husband had built a beautiful, ecologically friendly house on a brownfield site, and that it was an upgrade from the building that had previously occupied the area. Mrs Groen said that during construction, some aspects of the design had been required to be changed due to building regulations and refuted several of the comments made by the objector.

Mrs Groen considered the sound from the roof terrace would be no louder than what could be heard from other neighbouring properties; she said she and her husband always strived to be good neighbours and have worked with the community and Woodbridge Town Council. Mrs Groen said the current application had been made to correct the issues between the construction and the extant planning permission and was of the view that the balcony did not create overlooking, and invited the Committee to visit the site.

The Chair invited questions to Mrs Groen. In response to a question on the changes necessitated by building regulations, Mrs Groen said that to achieve the cooling process proposed for the dwelling, the fenestration needed to be able to open onto the flat roof, and that she had been told by the building inspector that therefore the glass surround was required.

Another member of the Committee queried why an application to vary the approved planning conditions had not been made prior to construction. Mrs Groen explained that the build had been complex and that the changes needed were not identified until after construction had begun.

Given the issues raised during the public speaking on the item, Councillor Deacon proposed that the determination of the application be deferred to facilitate the Committee undertaking a visit to the application site, to enable Members to understand the nature of the entire area along with the concerns of both the neighbouring resident and Woodbridge Town Council. This motion was seconded by Councillor McCallum and on being put to the vote it was unanimously

#### **RESOLVED**

That the determination of the application be **DEFERRED** to facilitate the Committee undertaking a visit to the application site, to enable Members to understand the nature of the entire area along with the concerns of both the neighbouring resident and Woodbridge Town Council.

#### **9 DC/23/2120/FUL - Land at Pages Hill, Alderton Road, Hollesley, IP12 3RN**

The Committee received report **ES/1865** of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, which related to planning application DC/23/2120/FUL. The application sought planning permission for the erection of a new agricultural machine store and workshop on land at Pages Hill, Alderton Road, Hollesley.

As the case officer's minded-to recommendation to approve the application was contrary to Hollesley Parish Council's recommendation to refuse the application it was presented to the Planning Referral Panel on 16 January 2024, in accordance with the scheme of delegation set out in the East Suffolk Council Constitution, where it was referred to the Committee for determination.

The Committee received a presentation from the Planner, who was the case officer for the application. The site's location was outlined and the Committee was shown an aerial photograph of the site. The Planner highlighted the current use of the site access

and noted the site was wholly located within the Suffolk and Essex Coast and Heaths National Landscape (formerly known as the AONB).

The Committee received the proposed block plan and elevations of the proposed structure. The Committee was also shown photographs demonstrating the following views:

- From within the site towards the proposed building location.
- Towards the access to the site.
- The existing access.
- Towards the junction of Alderton Road, Hollesley Road, and Lodge Road.
- Along Lodge Road.
- From Lodge Road towards the site.
- From Hollesley Road towards the site.
- From Coronation Avenue towards the site.
- A comparative image showing the site access today and in 2009.

The Planner provided drawings for the existing visibility splays and explained that the Highways Authority had recommended three conditions for visibility splays, surfacing and the discharge of surface water from the access. Officer did not consider these proposed conditions to be reasonable or necessary, given the existing access has been in use for a number of years, vehicle movements associated with the development would be low and the visibility splay condition would require the removal of fencing around Tye Barn.

The recommendation to approve the application, as detailed in the report, was outlined to the Committee, and the Chair invited questions to the officers.

A member of the Committee sought clarity on the proposed workshop use and the Planner said that the applicant's agent had advised that the use of the structure would be to store small pieces of agricultural machinery. In response to a query from another member of the Committee, the Planner said that the Highways Authority had not maintained its holding objection in its most recent consultation response.

A member of the Committee asked if there had been any previous issues with flooding from the access onto the highway; the Planner was not aware of any such issues and noted that the Highways Authority had initially shared the concerns of Hollesley Parish Council about the access, but that following further information being submitted by the applicant had withdrawn its objection.

The Chair invited Councillor Peter Jacks, representing Hollesley Parish Council, to address the Committee. Councillor Jacks said it was important to state Hollesley is a rural community and home to historic farm businesses which provide employment and maintain the village's green and beautiful status. Councillor Jacks said that Hollesley Parish Council's objection was two-fold, relating to highway safety and the effect on the street scene.

Councillor Jacks displayed an image showing the existing access and its relationship to the junction and highlighted the possible risk of farm traffic blocking the road, with limited opportunity for drivers to see this when turning right from Lodge

Road. Councillor Jacks noted that sand had previously been deposited from the access onto the road due to flooding, which had been reported to the Highways Authority in the past. Councillor Jacks said adding more farm traffic to the situation could create an accident black spot.

Councillor Jacks added that the village was wholly in the Suffolk and Essex Coast and Heaths National Landscape and displayed further images of the application site viewed from the wider area; Councillor Jacks considered that the proposed building would spoil the streetscene.

There being no questions to Councillor Jacks, the Chair invited Mr James Leggett, the applicant, to address the Committee. Mr Leggett said the proposed building would be a modest agricultural workshop and storage building for work being conducted on the agricultural estate, and would not create any additional traffic. Mr Leggett confirmed that the building would house smaller equipment rather than larger day-to-day machinery, which would be stored elsewhere.

Mr Leggett explained that the site had been chosen for its proximity to a worker's living quarters, as the worker in question would be the one using the building and the equipment therein. Mr Leggett said the access had been in use since his grandfather had built the houses in the 1950s.

Mr Leggett considered the building would be small in scale and requiring the conditions from the Highways Authority would result in a more formal appearance for the access. Mr Leggett said the site had a rural character and surfacing the access would take away from that, concluding that what was being proposed was a farm building in a farm landscape.

The Chair invited questions to Mr Leggett. Mr Leggett said that the building would be used for fencing repairs across the agricultural estate and would not increase farm vehicle movements. In response to another query, Mr Leggett said some light workshop activity, related to fence repairs, would take place in the building, but no heavy agricultural work involving large agricultural machinery.

The Chair invited the Committee to debate the application that was before it. Members of the Committee were supportive of the application and one Member noted that it was not often that applications were made to construct agricultural buildings, compared to those seeking to remove or convert them. Another member of the Committee said it was positive that the access would not be surfaced.

There being no further debate, the Chair sought a proposer and seconder for the recommendation to approve the application as set out in the report. On the proposition of Councillor Smithson, seconded by Councillor Deacon, 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 22210 6A received 20.07.2023, and 22210 2A received 26.05.2023, 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 hereby approved building shall only be used to store tools, machinery, equipment and vehicles for agricultural purposes, and for no other purpose.

Reason: The Local Planning Authority would not approve the building other than for purposes associated with the use and maintenance of agricultural land.

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. It is an OFFENCE to carry out works within the public highway, which includes a Public Right of Way, without the permission of the Highway Authority.

Any conditions which involve work within the limits of the public highway do not give the applicant permission to carry them out. Unless otherwise agreed in writing, all works within the public highway shall be carried out by Suffolk County Council or its agents at the applicant's expense.

The meeting concluded at 5.20pm.

.....  
Chair