

**Unconfirmed**



Minutes of a meeting of the **Planning Committee South** held in the Deben Conference Room, East Suffolk House, Melton, on **Wednesday, 6 March 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 Mark Packard, Councillor Rosie Smithson

**Other Members present:**

Councillor Deborah Dean, Councillor Lee Reeves

**Officers present:**

Jamie Behling (Planner), Nick Clow (Assistant Planner), Sarah Davis (Democratic Services Officer (Scrutiny and Member Development)), Matt Makin (Democratic Services Officer (Regulatory)), Natalie Webb (Senior Planner), Ben Woolnough (Planning Manager (Development Management, Major Sites and Infrastructure))

---

**1 Apologies for Absence and Substitutions**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Debbie McCallum and Mike Ninmey. Councillors Deborah Dean and Lee Reeves attended the meeting as substitutes for Councillors McCallum and Ninmey, respectively.

**2 Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Colin Hedgley declared a Non-Registerable Interest in the planning application being considered at item 4 of the agenda, as the application was located in his ward.

Councillor Lee Reeves declared a personal interest in the planning applications being considered at items 5 and 6 of the agenda and advised that he would recuse himself from the Committee for those items, in order to speak on the applications as ward member.

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

Councillors Mike Deacon, John Fisher, Katie Graham, Mark Packard, and Rosie Smithson all declared that they had been lobbied in respect of the planning application being considered at item 4 of the agenda, and had not responded to any correspondence.

Councillor Colin Hedgley declared that he had been lobbied in respect of the planning application being considered at item 4 of the agenda, and had replied only to invite the individual to register to speak on the application at the meeting and to confirm that he remained open minded on the issue.

#### **4 DC/22/4714/FUL - Three Horseshoes Inn, The Street, Charsfield, IP13 7PY**

The Committee received report **ES/1872** of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, which related to planning application DC/22/4714/FUL. The application sought full planning permission for the refurbishment of and extensions to the Three Horseshoes Public House in Charsfield, incorporating improved access, car park and outside facilities together with the construction of three two-bedroomed cottages to the western frontage of the site.

The application was before the Committee for determination at the request of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, as set out in the East Suffolk Council Constitution, due to the level of public interest in the proposal.

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planner, who was the case officer for the application. The site's location within the settlement boundary was identified and the Committee was advised that the principle of development was considered to accord with policies SCLP5.2 and SCLP5.7 of the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan (the Local Plan).

The Senior Planner set out the context of the site and noted the permitted development to the north of the site, which was on a site allocated for development by policy SCLP12.46 of the Local Plan. The Committee advised that the existing public house and there nearby buildings were not listed, and the Senior Planner outlined the site's proximity to flood zone 2.

The Committee was advised that four trees on the site's frontage were subject to Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) and the Council's Design and Heritage team was not objecting to their removal. The Senior Planner added that following consultation, the Flood Authority had not objected to the application.

The Committee was shown a map which demonstrated the site's proximity to public right of way 23, which was to the west. The Senior Planner explained that the site had been listed as an Asset of Community Value (ACV) on 28 November 2018; this listing expired on 11 December 2023 however the site was relisted on 28 November 2023 for a further period of five years, to 28 November 2028.

The Senior Planner referred to policy SCLP8.1 of the Local Plan, which stated that proposals to change the use, or redevelop for non-community use, of an ACV would not be permitted. The Committee was advised that the proposal did not result in the loss of an ACV and therefore accorded with this policy.

The Committee was shown aerial images of the site demonstrating the wider setting and a close-up view of the site, along with the site location plan and the proposed block plan.

The Senior Planner displayed photographs demonstrating views of the following:

- Looking east on The Street.
- The existing public house.
- The existing access point and informal parking area.
- Looking west on The Street.
- Looking towards the dwellings on St Peters Close.
- The former car park area.
- Looking back towards The Street.
- The area proposed for residential dwellings.
- Looking towards St Peters Close.
- Looking north-west from within the site.
- Looking north from within the site, towards new housing on St Peters Close.
- Looking east from within the site, towards the amenity space of London Villa.
- Looking from within the site towards London Villa and the area of public house extension.
- The western side of the existing public house.
- The existing outbuilding.

The Committee received the existing and proposed elevations and floor plans for both the public house and the proposed dwellings. The Committee was also shown a cross-section demonstrating the changes in ground level between the proposed dwellings and 2 St Peters Close, the existing public house plus proposed extension, and the boundary with London Villa. The proposed street scene was also displayed.

The material planning considerations and key issues were summarised as the principle of development, design and layout, the ACV, affordable housing, landscape and visual impact, biodiversity and ecology, residential amenity (including noise), highways and public right of way, flood risk and surface water drainage, land contamination, archaeology, and legal obligations (including a Section 106 agreement). The recommendation to delegate authority to approve the application to the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, detailed in the report, was outlined to the Committee.

The Chair invited questions to the officers. When asked regarding the Parish Council's comments on the loss of beer garden space, the Senior Planner noted that the whole of the site had previously been used as an informal parking area and beer garden and the site proposed creating a formal beer garden for the public house. The Planning Manager (Development Management, Major Sites and Infrastructure) added that this space would be retained to the east of the public house building.

A member of the Committee queried an objection about not being able to use a marquee on the site. The Senior Planner advised that the space reserved for a beer garden would be able to accommodate a marquee if required; the Planning Manager noted that for the regular use of a marquee, planning permission would be required.

The Chair invited Mr David Wolfe, who objected to the application, to address the Committee. Mr Wolfe said that he had lived in Charsfield for almost 20 years and until its closure, had been a regular customer of the public house. Mr Wolfe considered the

application sacrificed generous beer garden space for a much smaller element immediately to the rear of the building, and said this was why he and others in the community objected to the proposal.

Mr Wolfe said that objectors considered that redevelopment of the site was not needed to bring the public house back into use and argued that the proposal was not in accordance with policy SCLP8.1, as part of the ACV was being redeveloped for housing. Mr Wolfe noted that when the ACV was originally listed, the garden area had been included after persuasion from the community. Mr Wolfe said that if the development went ahead, the beer garden area would be lost forever.

Mr Wolfe said that although the community would gain three new dwellings it would lose the majority of the beer garden area and considered this would make the pub unviable, and thus eventually remove the asset from the community. Mr Wolfe noted that comparisons to the nearby Turk's Head public house were misleading and highlighted that the site to the north had been sold for redevelopment by the applicant several years ago, and they were now looking to redevelop the application site, letting the public house run down in order to do so.

Mr Wolfe considered the development was not to bring the pub back into use but to prepare the whole site for housing redevelopment and reiterated that it was not necessary, urging the Committee to refuse the application to protect the ACV. Mr Wolfe added that the site had not been on the market since 2012, when it was listed at double its worth.

The Chair invited questions to Mr Wolfe. Mr Wolfe advised the Committee that the public house had closed in 2019 and when asked how it could be made viable, was of the view that it was not unviable in its current state and this was the reason it was listed as an ACV. Mr Wolfe stated that the applicant had let the public house fall into disrepair and increased the rent in order to force its closure, and said that should the public house be put on the market for its proper value he was confident it would be purchased and successfully operated.

A member of the Committee asked Mr Wolfe if operating the premises as a community pub had been considered. Mr Wolfe said there was a community interest established if necessary, as a fall back position, but reiterated his belief that the premises could be operated on a commercial basis.

The Chair invited Councillor Fran Moor, representing Charsfield Parish Council, to address the Committee. Councillor Moor made it clear that the Parish Council wanted to see the public house reopened and retained as an important hub for the community.

Councillor Moor said that although the proposed scheme could achieve this, the Parish Council considered it inappropriate to build three houses at the expense of reducing the beer garden and relocating it to a less desirable area. Councillor Moor considered that to build housing on an ACV site was contrary to planning policy and saw no reason for this to be discounted.

Councillor Moor said that the proposed scheme would erode the ACV and noted that the ACV area was not co-terminus with the public house boundary. Councillor Moor expressed concern that future house owners may buy land not in the ownership of the public house and said there was no robust evidence that the housing was needed to make the public house viable.

Councillor Moor said the current beer garden was a positive feature of the public house and if the application was approved, this would be lost in perpetuity. Councillor Moor said the proceeds of the sale of the site to the north could have been used by the applicant to renovate the public house and said that its future viability should not be compromised. Councillor Moor concluded by suggesting that if the Committee approved the application, a "watertight" Section 106 agreement be put in place to ensure the continued presence of a public house on the site.

There being no questions to Councillor Moor, the Chair invited Mr David Houchell, the applicant's agent, to address the Committee. Mr Houchell highlighted that only 27 of 350 residents had objected to the application and suggested the revised beer garden would be more manageable in inclement weather.

Mr Houchell referred to many rural pubs in the area being sold off in the 1990s and said those that had been successful had improved their facilities. Mr Houchell noted the community support for the public house but said that funds were required to renovate it. Mr Houchell noted that community support for the public house had reduced before it closed and highlighted that several community groups moved their events to the village hall when it opened.

Mr Houchell highlighted that the applicant had originally planned to sell the premises when the last tenant left and the property had been valued at £350,000; a community group had made an offer on the premises but only in the region of £150,000. Mr Houchell said that £50,000 was needed to renovate the premises and considered the offer made by the community group to have been too low.

Mr Houchell stated that the site had been listed as an ACV unbeknownst to the applicant and cited the example of the nearby Turk's Head pub as being broadly supported. Mr Houchell said that a Section 106 agreement was being progressed and that the applicant was content with the officer's recommendation, including the proposed conditions.

The Chair invited questions to Mr Houchell. A member of the Committee asked what percentage of customers were likely to come from Charsfield. Mr Houchell did not have this information to hand but said the applicant was looking to attract customers from the wider area through good facilities for food and drink.

The same Member queried how reducing the parking capacity would help achieve this, when a successful country pub needed to attract people travelling from further afield. Mr Houchell said that the level of proposed parking was in line with Highways standards when compared to the number of covers that could be provided. Mr Houchell reiterated that good food and drink would attract customers from beyond Charsfield.

Another member of the Committee queried if the applicant intended to sell the public house. Mr Houchell advised that the applicant intended to renovate the pub and put it on the market, and had held discussions with housing associations about the three proposed dwellings. Mr Houchell said the applicant intended for the public house to be operated as such once renovated.

There being no further questions to Mr Houchell, the Chair invited the Planning Manager to address the Committee on issues raised during public speaking. The Planning Manager said the site to the north of the proposed development, its sale and any reinvestment into the application site was not something that should influence the determination of the application before the Committee.

The Planning Manager highlighted that the current parking arrangements were informal and the application sought to formalise parking and create a defined beer garden, and the community concerns were on the loss of the latter not the former. The Planning Manager confirmed that a Section 106 agreement was being sought to ensure the public house was reinvested in before any dwellings were occupied.

The Committee was advised that although some outdoor seating would be lost, indoor seating would be increased and the applicant considered this would make the premises more viable. The Planning Manager acknowledged that there was a wish in the community to retain the site as it was, but reminded the Committee it was required to determine the application based on material planning considerations.

When asked by a member of the Committee about the possible risk of a change of use for the public house, the Planning Manager said an application for change of use could be made in the future but that policy SCLP8.1 would still apply and if the site was listed as an ACV, there would be an option for a community group to purchase the public house.

The Chair invited the Committee to debate the application that was before it. A member of the Committee acknowledged the difficult situation around the application and considered the ACV status of the site was a central issue. The Member referred to policy SCLP8.1 and balanced the arguments of the development bring the public house back into use against the loss of some of the garden area included in the listing. The Member noted the importance of public houses in rural areas and suggested that should the Committee be minded to refuse the application, there was an argument that to do so would protect the ACV.

Another member of the Committee pointed out that the purpose of the application was to enable a successful public house to operate and considered this would not be the case as not enough parking would be provided. The Member said he was not convinced of the public house's long-term prospects.

There being no further debate on the application, 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. The recommendation was proposed by Councillor Packard, seconded by Councillor Smithson and by a majority vote **FAILED**.

The Committee sought to formulate an alternative recommendation. Councillor Dean 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 area along with the concerns of both the objectors and Charsfield Parish Council. This motion was seconded by Councillor Hedgley 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 area along with the concerns of both the objectors and Charsfield Parish Council.

## **5 DC/23/2694/FUL - The Ship, Church Lane, Levington, IP10 0LQ**

**NOTE:** Councillor Reeves recused himself from the Committee in order to speak as ward member on both this and the next agenda item.

The Committee received report **ES/1873** of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, which related to planning application DC/23/2694/FUL. The application sought planning permission to alter and extend The Ship Inn public house in Levington, including an enlarged parking area and terrace.

As the case officer's minded-to recommendation of approval was contrary to Levington and Stratton Hall Parish Council's recommendation of refusal, 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. The Panel referred the application to the Committee for determination due to the significant public interest in the application and its impact on the wider village of Levington.

The Committee received a presentation from the Planner, who was the case officer for the application. The Planner noted that the presentation was in respect of both this application and also the associated application DC/23/2695/LBC, which was to be considered at the next agenda item.

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

- The front of The Ship Inn.
- The east elevation from the beer garden.
- Towards the beer garden.
- The rear of The Ship Inn from the patio/dining area.
- The access along the side of The Ship Inn.
- The access to the car park from Church Lane, including looking in to the access.
- Looking along Church Lane to the east.
- The pedestrian access to the beer garden.
- Across the car park, including access to a neighbouring property and the adjacent churchyard.
- Looking north and north-west from the car park.

The Planner displayed the existing and proposed layout, elevations and floor plans. The Committee was also shown an aerial image of the existing parking arrangement, on an informal hardstanding area, and a drawing demonstrating how the car park would be expanded to 61 parking spaces from its current capacity of 40-45. The Planner provided a map detailing the proximity of objecting homes to the application.

The material planning considerations and key issues for application DC/23/2694/FUL were summarised as traffic, parking and access, natural environment, landscape, design, and residential amenity. The material planning consideration for application DC/23/2695/LBC was summarised as heritage. The recommendations to approve both applications, detailed in the reports, were outlined to the Committee.

The Chair invited questions to the officers. When asked by a member of the Committee on the Highways Authority's view on the concerns raised by the Parish Council, in respect of the access being concealed, the Planner advised that the Highways Authority had not raised any concerns about this aspect.

Another member of the Committee asked how many covers The Ship Inn could currently serve. The Planner stated that presently the premises could accommodate 60 internal covers and 170 external covers, and the proposals looked to add another 70 inside and 60 outside.

The Chair invited Councillor John Parrish, representing Levington and Stratton Hall Parish Council, to address the Committee. Councillor Parrish said the Parish Council was fully engaged with development within its area and considered any change should be safe and for the benefit of residents.

Councillor Parrish expressed the Parish Council's concerns relating to highway safety, highlighting the junction between Church Lane and the existing single track access to The Ship Inn's car park was the most dangerous area of the village's road network, located on a blind bend where visibility is impacted by an adjacent church wall.

Councillor Parrish noted that in 2015, the Parish Council had asked the Highways Authority to add white lines to three dangerous areas in the village, including this location, and was advised that white lines could not be painted on the bend at Church Lane due to the width of the highway. Councillor Parrish said it was therefore of concern to the Parish Council that the Highways Authority was not objecting to an increase in traffic in this area.

Councillor Parrish highlighted that in 1990 the former Suffolk Coastal District Council had refused planning permission on a property that opened up into Bridge Road due to the proposed increase in the use of the shared access with the pub.

Councillor Parrish said that the Parish Council was happy with how The Ship Inn operated for the most part but was concerned about the impact of the development on highway safety, and urged the Committee to visit the site before determining the application.



The Chair invited questions to Councillor Parrish. When asked by a member of the Committee, Councillor Parrish acknowledged that the use of the highway was outside of the applicant's control; he considered that the Highways Authority needed to do something to reduce speeding in the area.

Another member of the Committee sought clarity on the concerns about the exit from the car park to Church Lane. Councillor Parrish explained that when exiting the car park, the church wall blocked the view to the right, where the road was narrow and vehicles would be approach around a bend before increasing their speed.

In response to a query regarding accidents at this site, Councillor Parrish was unable to provide specific information but noted a recent incident near to the site where a resident was pulled over by her dog and was lying in the road for 40 minutes before an ambulance arrived.

The Chair invited Mr Nick Attfield, representing the Adnams plc (the applicant), to address the Committee. Mr Attfield described The Ship Inn as an iconic Grade II listed pub in a desirable area, which Adnams wanted to preserve moving forwards. Mr Attfield said that Adnams was taking a long-term approach to the premises.

Mr Attfield said the proposals looked to secure the ongoing viability of the premises, noting that a lot of rural pubs were under threat and/or closing down, with only the very best surviving. Mr Attfield noted that Adnams was working with an excellent operator in Deben Inns, who were committed to developing the premises and working with neighbours.

Mr Attfield described the premises as being small and having an awkward kitchen layout. Mr Attfield said the proposed development would improve both of these issues and increase the premises' viability, which in turn would increase employment opportunities and enhance the premises' status as a "destination pub".

Mr Attfield advised that Adnams had worked with officers to assess and refine the proposed scheme and had also engaged with neighbours to address specific concerns; he sought the Committee's support to secure the ongoing success of The Ship Inn.

The Chair invited questions to Mr Attfield. When asked if there was a maximum size for enterprises in such a location, Mr Attfield said there was and believed the increase in covers had been overstated earlier in the meeting. Mr Attfield said that the proposals would add 30 to 40 indoor covers and would increase the viability of the outside area during the summer months, and would address the current issues with the kitchen layout. Mr Attfield did not consider this went beyond the limit for a premises such as The Ship Inn.

Another member of the Committee noted that concerns had been raised about noise from vehicles moving on gravel and asked if the applicant would consider the feasibility of rubber matting. Mr Attfield said that the applicant would look at ways to compact the surface without using tarmac.

The Chair invited Councillor Lee Reeves, ward member, to address the Committee. Councillor Reeves cited his long association with Levington and

acknowledged that The Ship Inn was an asset to the community. Councillor Reeves said he did not object to the restyling of the kitchen area and a minor increase in capacity, but was concerned with what appeared to be a 57% increase in cover capacity, which he considered to be unsustainable.

Councillor Reeves highlighted that parking in the village was limited and displayed photographs demonstrating both the bend adjacent to the vehicular access and the narrow width of the access, and said that during busy periods access would be difficult.

Councillor Reeves noted that the car park was often used as a base for people walking in the countryside and said the proposed layout of the car park did not take into account the width of modern vehicles. Councillor Reeves displayed photographs showing the use of the car park, including pedestrian access, and concluded that the increase in capacity would make the car park unviable. Councillor Reeves requested that the Committee, should it be minded to approve the application, visit the site first.

The Chair invited questions to Councillor Reeves. At the request of a member of the Committee, Councillor Reeves clarified the location of his first photograph on a map of the site and surrounding area.

Another member of the Committee directed a question to officers and asked if "go slow" type signs could be installed in the area. The Planning Manager (Development Management, Major Sites and Infrastructure) advised that this was not in the gift of the application before the Committee, but was something the Parish Council could request of the Highways Authority.

A member of the Committee asked Councillor Reeves if he agreed the premises was currently thriving and not at risk of failing, and therefore further development was unnecessary. Councillor Reeves replied that in his opinion the premises was very popular in the summer months and still did well outside of that period; he acknowledged that the kitchen works may be needed.

The Chair invited the Committee to debate the application that was before it. Several members of the Committee spoke in support of the application, noting there was a need for a successful premises to expand and noting that the highways issues raised were outside of the applicant's control.

A member of the Committee, who supported the application, noted that, whilst it was outside of the application's remit, it was important to acknowledge the concerns of the community regarding highway safety and stated there should be more flexibility and reaction the Highways Authority.

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 Hedgley, 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 carried out in all respects strictly in accordance with the following approved plans, 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:

Site location Plan received 07/07/2023

Proposed Layout Plan received 07/07/2023

Proposed South and West Elevations received 07/07/2023

Proposed East and North Elevations received 07/07/2023

Proposed Site Block Plan received 07/07/2023

Proposed Parking Reorganisation Rev C received 26/10/2023

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. No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure. Soft landscape works shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed number/densities where appropriate; implementation programme.

Reason: To ensure the provision of amenity afforded by appropriate landscape design.

5. Prior to installation of any lighting, details in respect of the following shall be submitted to and approved by the Council as Local Planning Authority:

- Details of any external lighting proposed on the building or within the site, showing location, on plans and elevations, including the type of light unit, numbers and illumination levels to be supplied and agreed in writing prior to installation.

The lighting shall be installed in accordance with such approved details.

Reason: In order to safeguard the dark skies and tranquillity of the landscape within the Suffolk & Essex Coast & Heaths National Landscape.

6. Prior to commencement of any works, details in respect of the following shall be submitted to and approved by the Council as Local Planning Authority. The work shall be carried out in accordance with such approved details:

- Representative door and windows and details to show materials, finish, appearance, ironmongery, type of glazing, glazing bar profile

Reason: In order to safeguard the special architectural or historic interest of the building.

7. Prior to the installation/modification of any extract equipment, air conditioning, refrigeration or any other fixed plant, details of the equipment and a noise and odour impact assessment shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in accordance with the updated current guidance: Control of Odour and Noise from Commercial Kitchen Exhaust Systems-An update to the 2004 report prepared by NETCEN for the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs.

The risk assessment shall identify potential sources of odour/noise, pathways and receptors and make recommendations regarding the level of mitigation needed. The LPA will be expecting that a rating level (LAeq) of at least 5dB below the typical background (LA90) is achieved.

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

8. Prior to development a detailed Tree Protection Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved tree protection measures.

Reason: In order to safeguard the trees on site.

9. Prior to the first use of the proposed extension, the car park shall be laid out and completed as shown on drawing - Proposed Parking Reorganisation Rev C, unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to provide sufficient parking for the intended use.

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.

## **6 DC/23/2695/LBC - The Ship, Church Lane, Levington, IP10 0LQ**

The Committee received report **ES/1874** of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, which related to planning application DC/23/2695/LBC. The application sought listed building consent to alter and extend The Ship Inn in Levington.

The application was presented to the Committee for determination for completeness, as it was associated with application DC/23/2694/FUL, which had been determined by the Committee under the previous agenda item having been referred to the Committee for determination by the Planning Referral Panel.

The Planner, who was the case officer for the application, referred to his presentation for the previous item (recorded under item 5 of these minutes) which had been in respect of both this application and also the associated application DC/23/2694/FUL, approved by the Committee earlier in the meeting.

The Chair invited Councillor John Parrish, representing Levington and Stratton Hall Parish Council, to address the Committee. Councillor Parrish said he had covered the majority of his points when speaking on the previous application earlier in the meeting. Councillor Parrish reiterated the Parish Council's concerns regarding parking and the egress onto the highway.

Councillor Parrish welcomed that the plans showed an improvement to the disabled access to the premises and that there would be more than one accessible entrance. Councillor Parrish said that further consideration should be given to accessible toilet facilities within the premises.

The Chair invited questions to Councillor Parrish. Councillor Parrish advised that if the proposed accessible toilet facility was unisex, this allayed his concerns.

The Chair invited Mr Nick Attfield, representing Adnams plc (the applicant), to address the Committee. Mr Attfield, having spoken on the previous application, elected not to speak again.

The Chair invited Councillor Lee Reeves, ward member, to address the Committee. Councillor Reeves, having spoken on the previous application, elected not to speak again.

The Chair invited the Committee to debate the application that was before it. A member of the Committee spoke on the positives on improving the disabled access to the premises and sought assurances this would be delivered; at the invitation of the Chair, Mr Attfield confirmed this would be the case.

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 Hedgley, seconded by Councillor Smithson, it was by a unanimous vote

## **RESOLVED**

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

1. The works to which this consent relates must be begun not later than three years from the date of this notice.

Reason: In accordance with Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

2. The works to which this consent relates shall be completed in all respects strictly in accordance with the Site Location Plan, Proposed Layout Plan, Proposed South and West Elevations, Proposed East and North Elevations and Proposed Site Block Plan received 07/07/2023, for which consent 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: In order to safeguard the special architectural or historic interest of the building.

4. Prior to commencement of any works, details in respect of the following shall be submitted to and approved by the Council as Local Planning Authority. The work shall be carried out in accordance with such approved details:

- Representative door and windows and details to show materials, finish, appearance, ironmongery, type of glazing, glazing bar profile

Reason: In order to safeguard the special architectural or historic interest of the building.

**NOTE:** following the determination of this item, Councillor Lee Reeves returned to the Committee.

## **7 DC/23/3698/FUL - Ford Gatehouse, Ford Road, Marlesford, IP13 0AS**

The Committee received report **ES/1875** of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, which related to planning application DC/23/3698/FUL. The application sought planning permission to add a first floor to Ford Gatehouse, Ford Road, Marlesford.

As the case officer's minded-to recommendation of approval was contrary to Marlesford Parish Council's recommendation of refusal, the application was presented to the Planning Referral Panel on 19 December 2023 in accordance with the scheme of delegation set out in the East Suffolk Council Constitution. The Panel referred the application to the Committee for determination due to the significant impact of the proposed alterations on the character of the dwelling and the wider landscape.

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's attention was drawn to the number of public rights of way that neighboured the application.

The Committee was shown several images demonstrating views into the site, along with the existing and proposed elevations and floor plans, along with the plans for a replacement dwelling approved in 2013 and the proposed block plan. The Committee also received images demonstrating views towards the site from a variety of surrounding locations.

The material planning considerations and key issues were summarised as the landscape character and the design quality. The recommendation to approve the application, detailed in the report, was outlined to the Committee.

There being no questions to the officers, the Chair invited Councillor Roger Waterfall, representing Marlesford Parish Council, to address the Committee. Councillor Waterfall described the site as an isolated development that was visible from several vantage points in the surrounding countryside. Councillor Waterfall said the development would convert a small cottage to a large house when the former was needed in Marlesford, highlighting that people were moving out of the village due to a lack of smaller properties.

Councillor Waterfall expressed concern about the additional traffic the development would bring as the site was accessed by narrow lanes, some that had been designated as quiet lanes. Councillor Waterfall added that there was no street lighting in the area and the development would negatively impact on the site being a "dark" area.

Councillor Waterfall expressed reservations about the development, highlighting the high fence already in place that he considered was more in keeping with a housing estate; he said that the development would stand out negatively in the landscape.

The Chair invited questions to Councillor Waterfall. When asked if the Parish Council was objecting to the design or the enlargement of the dwelling, Councillor Waterfall advised that both elements were of concern but the Parish Council was primarily concerned with the increase in building size, considering the redevelopment to be a loss of an older building and part of the village scene.

In response to a member of the Committee, Councillor Waterfall stated that the dwelling was 200 metres away from the nearest property and 400 metres from the village church.

The Chair invited Mr Dominic Gravener, the applicant, to address the Committee. Mr Gravener highlighted that he already had planning permission for alterations and extensions for a garage and first floor extension, and had not implemented the latter.

Mr Gravener said the development would not change the footprint of the building and create only a small increase on existing floor areas, and would turn the dwelling into a four-bedroom property. Mr Gravener did not agree with the assertion that the proposals constituted overdevelopment.

Mr Gravener said the site was in an isolated area with the nearest property 600 metres away. Mr Gravener noted that the only objector to the application was the Parish Council and that his neighbour was supportive of the proposals. Mr Gravener considered the development would upgrade and improve the property and remove the

need for extensions, stating that the design would enhance the area. Mr Gravener concluded by stating that it would be a missed opportunity if the application was not approved.

The Chair invited questions to Mr Gravener. When asked by a member of the Committee, Mr Gravener asserted that the nearest property to the application site was 600 metres away and disagreed with the measurement provided by Councillor Waterfall.

Another member of the Committee asked if the development would improve the energy efficiency of the property. Mr Gravener confirmed this would be the case.

The Chair invited the Committee to debate the application that was before it. The Vice-Chair said he was familiar with the site and had some sympathy with the views of the Parish Council, but saw no material planning reasons to oppose the application and was content to support it. Another member of the Committee added his support to the application.

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 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 Proposed Floor Plans and Proposed Elevations, Block and Site Location Plan received 26/09/2023, 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.

## **8 DC/23/3760/FUL - 10 Levington Lane, Bucklesham, IP10 0DZ**

The Committee received report **ES/1876** of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, which related to planning application DC/23/2760/FUL. The application sought planning permission for the retention of a boundary fence at 10 Levington Lane, Bucklesham.

As the case officer's minded-to recommendation of approval was contrary to Bucklesham Parish Council's recommendation of refusal, the application was presented to the Planning Referral Panel on 9 January 2024 in accordance with the scheme of delegation set out in the East Suffolk Council Constitution, and the Panel 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 Assistant Planner highlighted that the fence to be retained was adjacent to the highway. The Committee was shown aerial photographs of the site along with images of the existing elevations as submitted by the applicant. The Assistant Planner advised the Committee that under permitted development rights, a fence erected next to a highway can be no more than 1 metre in height.

The Committee was shown photographs demonstrating the wider scene view of Levington Lane, including examples of similar fences in the area. The Committee was also shown other examples of close border fences in Bucklesham that had been approved in 2013 and 2019.

The material planning considerations and key issues were summarised as visibility, ecological impacts, visual amenity, and residential amenity. The recommendation to approve the application, detailed in the report, was outlined to the Committee.

The Chair invited questions to the officers. In response to a query on a lack of a response from the Council's ecologist, the Assistant Planner advised that due to the size and scale of the development, a response was not required. Another member of the Committee asked about the removal of vegetation to install the fence and the Assistant Planner advised that the wall had already been in place prior to the fence's installation, and the vegetation removed had been behind the boundary.

The Chair invited Ms Jo Last, the applicant, to address the Committee. Ms Last said she had opted to attend to provide further detail on the background of the application; she explained that the planting had been removed as it was posing a potential risk of weakening the existing wall, and the fence was erected in replacement.

Ms Last confirmed that the planting established since the fence's erection was establishing itself and beginning to grow through both sides of the fence, and further planting would take place if the application was approved.

Ms Last highlighted that this was the third year that the fence had been in place and that Bucklesham Parish Council would have been well aware of it, as they meet at the village hall next door. Ms Last said there had been no objections to the fence until an unrelated disagreement with the Parish Clerk had occurred, and neighbours opposite had not objected to the fence.

Ms Last pointed out that there many different styles and heights of fences in Bucklesham and therefore her fence was not out of keeping with the character of the area. Ms Last added that many people using the pub and village hall parked outside her home with their engines running and the fence provided some barrier to exhaust fumes.

Ms Last said she did not intentionally avoid seeking planning permission as she was unaware it was required, assuring the Committee that she would comply with any conditions imposed should the application be approved.

The Chair invited questions to Ms Last. Ms Last confirmed that she had planted clematis to screen the fence.

There being no debate on the application, 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 completed in all respects strictly in accordance with the Location Plan received on 29.09.2023 and the Block Plan, dimensioned photographs, and applicant's email with photographs received on 12.10.2023, for which permission is hereby granted.

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

2. 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.

The meeting concluded at 4.25pm.

.....  
Chair