

**Unconfirmed**



Minutes of a Meeting of the **Planning Committee North** held in the Conference Room, Riverside, on **Tuesday, 14 May 2024 at 2:00 PM**

**Members of the Committee present:**

Councillor Paul Ashdown, Councillor Paul Ashton, Councillor Julia Ewart, Councillor Katie Graham, Councillor Malcolm Pitchers, Councillor Sarah Plummer, Councillor Geoff Wakeling

**Officers present:** Joe Blackmore (Principal Planner (Development Management, North Area Lead)), Katy Cassidy (Democratic Services Officer), Martin Clarke (Licensing Manager and Housing Lead Lawyer), Ellie DeGory (Assistant Planner), Mia Glass (Enforcement Planner), Natalie Levett (Senior Planner), Eloise Limmer (Senior Design and Heritage Officer), Agnes Ogundiran (Conservative Political Group Support Officer), Phil Perkin (Principal Planner (Major Sites)), Rachel Smith (Principal Planner (Development Management, Central Area Lead)), Ben Woolnough (Interim Joint Head of Planning)

---

**1 Apologies for Absence and Substitutions**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Parker. Councillor Smithson attended as their substitute.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Gee. Councillor Back attended as their substitute.

**2 Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Ashton declared an other registerable interest and recused themselves from agenda item 6 as they had opposed that item.

Councillor Ashton declared an other registerable interest and recused themselves from agenda item 10 as East Suffolk Council were the land owners.

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

Councillors Plummer, Ewart, Ashdown, Pitchers and Wakeling all declared that they had been lobbied via email on items 6 and 7 and had given no response.

Councillor Ashton had been lobbied extensively on items 6 and 7, as declared in agenda item 2, Councillor Ashton recused himself from voting on item 6, however as no opinion had been given for item 7, he remained on the Committee.

#### **4 Minutes**

On the proposition of Councillor Ashdown, seconded by Councillor Wakeling, it was by a unanimous vote

#### **RESOLVED**

that the minutes of the meeting held on 9 April 2024 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair

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

The Committee received report ES/1946 of the Interim Joint Head of Planning 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 24 April 2024. At that time there were 17 such cases. The Chair invited the Enforcement Planner to comment on the report.

The Enforcement Planner advised that:

- Notice had been served at 243 London Road South, Lowestoft, relating to the replacement of a shop front, further detail would be provided in June's enforcement report.
- The Street, Lound, a compliance visit took place on 29/04/24, following this visit the enforcement team were not satisfied that the notice had been fully complied with, therefore this had been referred to the legal team.

The Enforcement Planner advised that there were no further updates to the report and the Chair invited questions from the members.

Councillor Ashdown queried the expected timeframe for the legal work and when the Committee could expect to see actions. The Enforcement Planner confirmed that they had a new appointment within the legal team who would be focusing on planning enforcement cases and agreed to keep Councillor Ashdown updated of progress.

It was noted that the date in Item B.7 needed to be corrected to 19/04/2024.

Councillor Ewart requested an update on progress on items F.2 and F.3. The Licensing Manager and Housing Lead Lawyer confirmed that they had employed a Litigation Lead Lawyer to deal with enforcement matters and advised that both cases were progressing with the legal team, and as the landowners were not present at the public meeting further updates would be given outside of the meeting.

On the proposition of Councillor Ashdon, seconded by Councillor Wakeling, it was by a unanimous vote **RESOLVED** That the outstanding enforcement matters up to 24 April 24 be noted.

**DC/21/4006/OUT - Land South of Darsham Station, Main Road, Darsham**

The Committee received report ES/1947 of the Interim Joint Head of Planning which related to planning application DC/21/4006/OUT.

The application sought outline planning permission for the erection of up to 110 dwellings, public open space and associated infrastructure.

The Committee received a presentation from the Principal Planner (Major Sites), who was the case officer for the application. The site's location plan and an aerial photograph were shared with the Principal Planner highlighting Darsham Railway Station to the north of the site and the Grade I listed Cockfield Hall to the West, the A12 running along the western boundary of the site, with Westleton road on the southern boundary. It was pointed out that Yoxford was a short distance away to the South West and the entire site was approximately 7.5 hectares.

The Principal Planner told the Committee that the site was allocated in the Local Plan for approximately 120 dwellings, the allocation policy criteria were shared with the Committee, with the main ones to be focused on listed as:

Residential use to be contained within the northern half of the site alongside communal open space provision.

- c) Provision of affordable housing on site.
- e) Improved pedestrian and cycle connectivity with the station and Yoxford village will be required, including a crossing point to provide links to the existing footway network.
- f) Vehicle access from the south of the site through the southern half of the site which is to be otherwise retained as agricultural land reflecting the rural setting in proximity to Cockfield Hall Park.
- g) Design and layout of the development to respond to the Cockfield Hall Park historic park and garden and be sympathetic to the setting of the Grade I listed Cockfield Hall and the setting of Yoxford Conservation Area.

The Principal Planner noted that the application was accompanied by a Framework Plan, which set out the clear design principles of the development of the site, eg differing building heights, pedestrian links and the two crossings of the A12, and had been worked up via detailed pre-application discussions with the applicant and as part of the determination of the application in conjunction with the Design and Heritage Officer.

Photos were shared, showing differing views of the site to give context to the Committee and highlighting the locations where the signalised and non-signalised crossings of the A12 were proposed.

The Principal Planner noted that the application was submitted in 2021 and since then there had been extensive negotiations with the Highway Authority to achieve improved cycle and pedestrian connectivity to the railway station and Yoxford. Slides were shared with the Committee highlighting what the planned improvements

were. The proposed cycle path and footpath were shown, with the Principal Planner highlighting the planned width of 3.5 metres in the majority of the improvements, noting that where it was not possible to achieve this width, the narrower width was still acceptable to the Highway Authority.

The Principal Planner pointed out that in addition to the off-street highway works planned with the application, there were other non-associated applications that would also deliver highway improvements, eg junction improvements to the Leiston road associated with the development of Sizewell C and the tourism development application at Cockfield Hall which would see the private access upgraded to public footpath linked to Yoxford High Street. Whilst this wasn't a material consideration, the Principal Planner noted that it indicated what might come forward in the future.

An illustrative aerial plan of the site was shared with the Committee showing the proposed layout of the site.

The material planning considerations and key issues were summarised as:

- Principle of development
- Design and layout considerations
- Highway considerations
- Landscape and visual impact
- Heritage considerations
- Flood risk
- Ecology
- Public benefits

The Principal Planner explained that one of the main reasons for the time spent in getting the application to Committee was the negotiations for the highway and cycle connectivity improvements agreements with the Highway Authority. It was noted on the update sheet that the A12 signalised crossing was still to be fully designed, but if it transpired not possible to accommodate such a crossing then the Highways Authority had requested a section 106 contribution towards Yoxford Primary School pupil transport costs.

The recommendation to delegate authority to the Interim Joint Head of Planning to approve the application for planning permission was outlined to the Committee.

The Chair invited question from the Committee to the Principal Planner.

In response to a question from Councillor Graham regarding pedestrian and cycle access routes, the Principal Planner confirmed that there was land alongside the A12 that formed part of the Highway which would be accessed. Councillor Graham expressed concern shared from the Parish Council that should the verge be removed it would feel very unsafe and act as a deterrent to use it, particularly for people with disabilities or young families as it would be so close to the A12.

Councillor Graham asked if both crossings were proposed to be signalised or just one. The Principal Planner confirmed that one was proposed to be signalised with the crossing at the northern end of the site not being signalised.

The Interim Joint Head of Planning added that they were confident that the southern crossing could be delivered as a signalised crossing, the Highways authority had added this as a condition and the plans had been subject to scrutiny from Highways and Road Safety audits, noting that the section 106 contribution was very much a safety net.

In response to the Chair, it was clarified that the non-signalised cross was not proposed to have a mid-point, it would involve crossing both carriageways.

Councillor Ashdown questioned, should the application be approved, would the reserve matters application return to Planning Committee North? The Interim Joint Head of Planning confirmed that whilst it was not guaranteed that reserve matters applications return to planning committee following outline approval, they were subject to the same scheme of delegation and scrutiny as an outline application, adding with an application of this scale it was likely that it would come in front of committee.

Councillor Ewart noted the potential attraction of the properties to people coming into the area for the Sizewell development and asked whether any legislation existed where the purchase could be linked to someone who had been living in the IP17 postcode for a long time.

Councillor Ewart commented on the magnitude of the development and the wider picture of developments locally, raising concern about the information provided and whether all of the planned consented developments were being considered, such as the Yoxford roundabout, the new A12 layout, the park and ride at Darsham and the subsequent increased volume of traffic, which would include a large influx of construction vehicles.

The Interim Joint Head of Planning reassured the Committee that as the outline application was already in existence this would have been considered as part of the County's Sizewell C transport modelling and safety assessments. They noted that the Highway authority would have been aware of all of the developments and looked at this application as a subservient element to those overarching plans. In addition, the applicant would also have been required to consider how this development would function in isolation. The Principal Planner presented other compatible changes that could exist and the Highway authority were fully aware of all of the developments and the changes that would occur on the A12 corridor and consider them to be suitable alongside the amount of development proposed.

Councillor Ewart acknowledged the comments made, querying why the information pack received did not explain all of the A12 developments, in particular referencing a document Planning Inspectorate Reference Joint Local Impact Report. The Principal Planner referred members to paragraph 6.20 of the report which outlined how Sizewell C was considered concurrently, confirming that the transport assessment submitted with the application, had regard to the transport assessment for Sizewell C and the trip rates, and concluded that there were no operational capacity issues in future years and the proposed generated traffic could be comfortably accommodated by the existing network.

Councillor Wakeling questioned by how much the layby would be shortened,

expressing concern as the layby was used as a truck stop. The Principal Planner confirmed that it would be shortened to accommodate the proposed crossing, and there had been extensive negotiations involving the police prior to agreement. It was clarified that the reduction would be at the Darsham Station end.

Councillor Graham referred back to the issue of road crossings, noting that in the local plan one of the ambitions was to maximise the possibilities for sustainable travel. They noted that the feeling from the Parish Council representations is that what was proposed was not safe and there had been a request to consider a walk away bridge rather than this non-middle point pedestrian crossing, asking why this was not acted upon? The Principal Planner confirmed that there had never been an intention to have a bridge across the A12. The Interim Joint Head of Planning stated a bridge would need considerable landing space on both sides and would require third party land beyond the highway to be available, adding this was not something that the Highway Authority had asked for at either local plan or application stage and the whole application was subject to road safety audit.

Councillor Smithson noted that one of the problems with many outline planning applications was that material consideration hadn't been considered and by the time they are looked at things could change, eg reduced affordable housing. Councillor Smithson added they would be much happier to see stronger material considerations, as there wasn't a full understanding of what was being offered, only a potential if the road crossing didn't work of a bus to take children to school that doesn't meet needs of whole community. In response the Interim Joint Head of Planning reiterated that the school transport section 106 was a safeguard fall back only and was not likely to be required as a signalised crossing was to be provided as part of the development.

The Interim Joint Head of Planning added that the reserve matters would follow on for future consideration and an outline proposal was a completely acceptable proposal to submit, with reserve matters not deemed necessary at that stage. With this application and the submission of the parameter plans and master plan, everything was very well informed with surveys and assessments behind, leading to more detail at reserve matter stage. The Committee should be reassured from all of the work that has gone into this application from the Case Officer, Design and Heritage Officer, flood authority and highways authority all working together.

Councillor Ewart referred to the LLFA comments within the report and the Interim Joint Head of Planning advised the Committee to only refer to the latest response consultation as that would supersede the previous consultation.

Councillor Ewart noted the flooding risk at Yoxford and the situation that the residents had experienced to date. The Interim Joint Head of Planning told the Committee that all new developments were expected to attenuate or infiltrate surface water on the site, so what was released was only released at a greenfield run off rate, meaning no more water than would come off an agricultural or greenfield site. The proposed site had basins, swales, and infiltration opportunities. The Interim Joint Head of Planning noted that the response from the LLFA meant that they were confident that this would not add to existing problems in the area, and this would be further built upon through reserve matters application, adding further conditions for more detailed analysis. The Interim Joint Head of Planning confirmed that at this stage this was a site

designed which meets sustainable urban draining systems and addresses concerns.

Councillor Ewart asked when the attenuation basins would be made. The Interim Joint Head of Planning confirmed that the site had a condition which meant that they would have construction surface water management, meaning interim basins or final basin completed and used in interim way, they added that they were conscious that the site was on a slope, and had bad experiences in the last year, so construction surface water was being looked at, working closely with the County Council.

Councillor Ewart asked if this should have been conditioned right from the outset, the Interim Joint Head of Planning assured the Committee that they were all very concerned about flooding, adding that they had received a satisfactory response from the LLFA which should reassure the Committee that all checks and balances were in place. Councillor Ewart expressed concern with the non signalised crossing and requested that this was thought out.

There being no further questions for the Principal Planner, the Chair invited Councillor Ballantine, Darsham Parish Council, to make to speak.

Councillor Ballantine stated that they represented Darsham Parish Council but considered the views of Yoxford and Westleton Parish Councils. Councillor Ballantine outlined the following concerns to the Committee. Their main concerns were with the A12 as it was a major arterial road, adding although highways had specified a signal point across the A12, they considered it to be inherently unsafe. Their original submission suggested a pedestrian cycle bridge across the A12, but they were told it was too expensive. The proposed crossing point was north of the road junction with Westleton road, which was a busy road, leading to the farm shop and caravan site, it was extremely narrow in places with no footpath or lighting. The crossing point would be on an unlit section of road which comes from a lit 30 mile an hour zone, through an S bend into a 40 mph zone, just north of a bend where a head on collision took place recently. The other proposed crossing was to the north of the development and not signalled and on a hilltop. The proposed joint pedestrian/cycle footpath was inadequate for any parents wishing to walk their children to school and for any people wishing to walk or cycle to Darsham station. In the winter months this would result in walking in the dark with their backs to the traffic. If people use cars this could lead to an extra 1000 traffic movements in and out of the site each day with all of these wishing to access the A12. Sizewell park and ride or Cockfield Hall appeared to not be taken into account. The Sizewell Traffic Forum held on 8th May stated there were currently 15000 traffic movements a day across the Darsham crossing, this number would only increase in the future. It was currently very difficult to turn right from Westleton road, and there appeared to be no amendments to that junction. This Section of road was liable to frequent flooding and overflow from sewage which runs into people's housing. The nearest shop would be Budgens, anyone wishing to use that would have to cross the A12 twice. The housing mix in particular blocks of flats were out of place and would be visible from the A12. Although electric charging points had now been added there was still no compulsion to install solar panels. The area was not well served by services such as Doctors.

The Chair invited questions from the Committee to Councillor Ballantine

In response to a question from Councillor Pitchers regarding the proposed changes to the footpaths and cycle ways, Councillor Ballantine confirmed they were unacceptable as they would be too close to the road with the volume of traffic that passes along the A12.

In response to a question from Councillor Ewart, Councillor Ballantine stated that some children go to school in Yoxford and others use schools that parent can drive to. Following a discussion regarding where the children get on the bus, it was agreed that they use the layby proposed to be shortened.

There being no further questions, the Chair invited the applicant, Richard Martin to make their representation.

Mr Martin told the Committee that the application started in 2019 when the local plan was progressing with the site as an emerging allocation. Following completion of the technical studies, extensive pre-application discussions took place with officers in 2020/21 during which time the local plan was adopted. The applicants carried out public consultation with local residents as well as Darsham Parish Council and the neighbouring councils in Yoxford and Westleton. Mr Martin stated that the planning application was submitted in August 21, with significant changes being made following submission, in response to feedback from technical consultees. Mr Martin confirmed that positive engagement occurred throughout to ensure the application came to committee having addressed the additional requirements in respect of highways, drainage, landscape and heritage and archaeology. The Section 106 agreement had been drafted and secured contributions towards secondary school transport and Rams with other financial matters covered by CIL. To summarise, Mr Martin confirmed that the development would provide 110 plan led homes including 36 affordable homes, 6 self build plots, 2 new crossing plans, children's play space and biodiversity net-gain. The economic developments were stated as CIL receipts, job creation, support for local business. Mr Martin confirmed that the application, whilst in outline form, met high standards with the detail being developed through a future reserve matters application. Mr Martin told the committee that the proposals represented sustainable development in accordance with the adopted local plan.

The Chair invited questions to the applicant. Councillor Smithson asked about sustainable building, noting the properties mortgageable life and how it should be a given that the highest standards of building regulations are adhered to. The applicant confirmed that this was an outline application and this would all be covered within the detail of the reserve matters application. Continuing this theme, Councillor Graham sought confirmation that the building regulations would not simply be complied with but that they would go above. The applicant confirmed that they could not answer that as they were the promoter and not the builder, adding that they imagined it would be the case.

The applicant confirmed that there was provision for affordable housing agreed within the section 106 agreement, with a 70/30 split – 70 relating to rent and 30 relating to ownership.

There was a discussion regarding the proposed changes of the A12 regarding Sizewell and how these were factored into the development as it didn't appear clear from the

reports. The applicant confirmed that the application had been worked through with Highway Engineers, who produced the road safety audit, which was then independently verified and signed off by Suffolk County Council.

The applicant confirmed that they had employed consultants to carry out site specific transport assessments which would have embodied all of the planned highway changes regarding Sizewell C. The applicant confirmed that they were the promoter and they didn't own the land.

There being no further questions for the applicant, the Chair invited the Councillor Ashton, Ward Councillor to speak.

Councillor Ashton described in detail to the committee the proposed cycling/walking route, outlining the challenges faced and in some cases the areas where it was not possible to mitigate due to the narrow nature of the paths. Councillor Ashton noted the housing challenges faced in the area, particularly with the forthcoming Sizewell C developments, which had the risk of consuming all private rental sector housing and holiday lets for workers. Councillor Ashton added that the following needed to be addressed:

- Northern crossing should have a refuge.
- Crossing needed near the petrol station. Not in deeds of obligation, and something that ought to be added on to Sizewell C application.
- Concern over bungalows on the site, due to potential clientele and remote site nature.

Councillor Ashton listed the following priorities to be addressed in order of importance for mitigating the cycle/walking route:

1. Width of pavement in Yoxford on 12 near A1120 junction
2. The pavement on the A12 near Cockfield Hall
3. Lack of refuge on the northern crossing
4. Lack of signalisation on the southern road

The Chair invited questions to Councillor Ashton, Ward Councillor. There was a discussion regarding the challenges of turning right on to the A12 from the Westleton road, Councillor Ashton referred to the Highways assessment carried out. Responding to whether there should be more data/information on emissions and traffic management, the Committee was referred to the work carried out by the County Council officers and the additional analysis that had been carried out by them through the Sizewell C work.

In response to Councillor Pitchers, Councillor Ashton confirmed that they had always been concerned about the remoteness of the site as it was creating a new settlement that isn't close enough to Yoxford or Darsham. Councillor Pitchers, noted the benefit of the new houses, however the biggest concern remained as the mitigation of the cycling/walking route. An alternative route could be a footpath through Cockfield Hall, but this had not been brought forward and had a heritage impact. There was a discussion regarding land ownership, in particular in the areas where the path/cycle route couldn't be widened, and it was confirmed that the constraints were where the

land was not owned by highways.

There being no further questions, the Chair invited the Committee to debate the application before them.

Councillor Pitchers questioned whether the application should be deferred given the balance of views they had heard. The Interim Joint Head of Planning confirmed that it was a possibility to defer if the Committee felt there were further considerations. The Interim Joint Head of Planning confirmed that there had been expert consideration given to the ability to accommodate a cycling/walking route by Highways. Noting the areas where the width was smaller were discussed and due to the context and the forward visibility it was felt that they met the highways acceptable standard. The Lead LFA and Highways had all been consulted with non-objection responses.

In response to the Chair, the Interim Joint Head of Planning confirmed that the Highway improvements for the application ended at the junction into Yoxford. The road safety audit recommended there should be safe measures implemented to ensure that they can dismount or that they can return to the highway as a cyclist.

Councillor Ashdown asked whether District CIL Funding could be used to fund the mitigation for Yoxford. The Interim Joint Head of Planning confirmed it was a possibility and referred to the Council's new cycling, walking and wheeling working group which would be proactively looking at these issues and collaborative use of CIL funding with district and parish councils.

Councillor Smithson referred to the possibility of Sizewell supporting with funding to mitigate the proposed crossing and ensuring it was signalled rather than just a pedestrian crossing. The Interim Joint Head of Planning noted there was potential for Sizewell's funding to be used collaboratively alongside CIL. Adding, although not guaranteed it was expected that the places most affected would be the first port of call for investment in infrastructure.

The possibility of pausing the application was raised whilst mitigation was considered. The Interim Joint Head of Planning advised the Committee to judge the application as it was before them today, noting it had been in the system for a long time with all statutory consultees satisfied.

There was a discussion regarding the possibility of the extension of the of the 30 mph zone through Yoxford. The Interim Joint Head of Planning confirmed that it was not clear what had been secured from Sizewell C as part of speed reductions.

Councillor Ewart referred to the A12 corridor and the challenges of making a decision on something that is fluid. The Interim Joint Head of Planning confirmed that Sizewell C proposals had been factored in to all allocations within the local plan. Qualifying the point regarding the location of the crossing, the Interim Joint Head of Planning confirmed that when you get to the detailed design stage section 278 agreement with the highway authority, they would be approving that the crossing needed to be provided in accordance with plans but subject to tweaks by highways. This technical detail was not expected to be signed off at planning application stage.

Councillor Ashdown noted that the Committee had received a very detailed report and there had been lots of questions and answers heard from ward members; on balance they felt they should approve this application. They added there would be mitigation coming forward and varying sources of funding to come in the future to assist with this, as it was an outline application they hoped to see reserve matters back before the Committee. Councillor Ashdown recommended approval.

Councillor Pitchers added having listened to all that had happened and the favourable experts' opinions, noting they were looking at the application before them and not taking into account Sizewell C or other developments, they could not see any grounds to refuse it and seconded the proposal.

Councillor Graham recognised that it had been agreed in the local plan, but added it seemed a bad decision to allocate as a settlement area as development was not going to be integrated with other communities, therefore not fulfilling policies 2.2 and 7.1 , with measures not encouraging people to travel actively, and it would remain a car dependent site. Should the application go ahead, they would like to see significant improvements with this.

Councillor Smithson concurred with Councillor Graham, requesting if it was possible to implement approve subject to improvements cycling and walking routes. The Interim Joint Head of Planning confirmed that this was not possible as the application was for outline with access included and so had to be considered as that. They noted that should a recommendation of refusal be considered, then this would require sound policy reasons to substantiate it, recognising the Highway's Authority professional opinion.

The Chair reassured the Committee that the agent and planning officers were listening to the debate and would be considering all that has been said today.

Councillor Graham, questioned if a condition for a mid-point (refuge) in the crossing could be added and whether there was room for lighting to be put along the stretch. The Principal Planner confirmed the signalised crossing would have to be lit. The Interim Joint Head of Planning referred to the plans for the crossings, adding if there was the potential to then it would have been designed in following the Highways considerations.

Councillor Ewart felt that the application was not as thorough as it should be and would not be voting for. Councillor Wakelin felt that the community had been separated and isolated and was uncomfortable with the two crossings, one which was not signalled and therefore would be refusing.

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 Ashdown, seconded by Councillor Pitchers, it was by the Chair's casting vote

**RESOLVED**

That the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

The development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission, or before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the later.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. Details of the layout, design and external appearance of the buildings, and the landscaping of the site (herein called the "reserved matters"), shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before any development is commenced. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To comply with Sections 91 and 92 of the 1990 Act.

3. A reserved matters application/s pursuant to this outline application shall provide for up to 110 dwellings and demonstrate substantial compliance with the Framework Plan (Drwg. No. 90-04 Rev A).

Reason: To ensure an attractive and high quality design of the development.

4. Any reserved matters application shall demonstrate broad compliance with Section 5 of the Design and Access Statement Revision F, February 2022, and design intent reflected on pages 48 and 49 (Southern Hamlet); 50 and 51 (open spaces) and pages 52 and 53 (Northern Reach).

Reason: The development needs to be sympathetic to the setting of the Grade I listed Cockfield Hall and the setting of Yoxford Conservation Area and therefore it is necessary to establish development parameters to ensure high quality design in any future reserved matters application.

5. Concurrent with the submission of the first reserved matters application, a site-wide phasing plan shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. Thereafter, the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved plan.

Reason: To ensure that the works are completed in an appropriate order, and for the purposes of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) collection requirements.

6. No other part of the development hereby permitted shall be commenced until the new access has been laid out and completed in broad accordance with drawing no. 1392\_HWY\_002. 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.

7. Before the development is commenced details of the areas to be provided for the storage and presentation for collection/emptying of refuse and recycling bins shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The approved scheme shall be carried out in its entirety before the development is brought into use and shall be retained thereafter for no other purpose (or) the approved bin storage and presentation/collection area shall be provided for each dwelling prior to its first occupation and shall be retained thereafter for no other purpose.

Reason: To ensure that space is provided for refuse and recycling bins to be stored and presented for emptying and left by operatives after emptying clear of the highway and access to avoid causing obstruction and dangers for the public using the highway.

8. Before the development hereby permitted is commenced a Construction Management Plan shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Construction of the development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved plan.

The Construction Management Plan shall include the following matters:

- a) parking and turning for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors
- b) loading and unloading of plant and materials
- c) piling techniques (if applicable)
- d) storage of plant and materials
- e) provision and use of wheel washing facilities
- f) programme of site and all associated works such as utilities including details of traffic management necessary to undertake these works
- g) site working and delivery times
- h) a communications plan to inform local residents of the program of works
- i) provision of boundary hoarding and lighting
- j) details of proposed means of dust suppression
- k) details of measures to prevent mud from vehicles leaving the site during construction
- l) haul routes for construction traffic on the highway network and
- m) monitoring and review mechanisms.
- n) Details of deliveries times to the site during construction phase.
- o) Layout of facilities above to be included on a plan.

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.

9. Before the development is commenced details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority showing the means to prevent the discharge of surface water from the development onto the highway including any system to dispose of the water. The approved scheme shall be carried out in its entirety before the access is first used and shall be retained thereafter in its approved form.

Reason: To prevent hazards caused by flowing water or ice on the highway.

10. Before the development is commenced, details of the estate roads and footpaths, (including layout, levels, gradients, surfacing, lighting, traffic calming and means of surface water drainage), shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety to ensure that roads/footways are constructed to an acceptable standard.

11. No dwelling shall be occupied until the carriageways and footways serving that dwelling have been constructed to at least Binder course level or better in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety to ensure that satisfactory access is provided for the safety of residents and the public

12. Before the development is commenced details of the infrastructure to be provided for electric vehicle charging points shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be carried out in its entirety before the development is brought into use and shall be retained thereafter and used for no other purpose.

Reason: In the interests of sustainable travel provision and compliance with Local Plan Sustainable Transport Policies.

13. Before the development is commenced details of the areas and infrastructure to be provided for the loading, unloading, manoeuvring and parking of vehicles including powered two-wheeled vehicles and electric vehicle charging points shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The approved scheme shall be carried out in its entirety before the development is brought into use and shall be retained thereafter and used for no other purpose (or for dwellings) The approved scheme shall be implemented for each dwelling prior to its first occupation and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the provision and long term maintenance of adequate on-site space for the parking and manoeuvring of vehicles in accordance with the current Suffolk Guidance for Parking (2023) where on-street parking and or loading, unloading and manoeuvring would be detrimental to highway safety.

14. Before [the development is commenced / any building is constructed above ground floor slab level] details of the areas to be provided for the secure, covered and lit cycle storage including electric assisted cycles shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The approved scheme shall be carried out in its entirety before the development is brought into use and shall be retained thereafter and used for no other purpose.(or for dwellings) The approved scheme shall be implemented for each

dwelling prior to its first occupation and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To promote sustainable travel by ensuring the provision at an appropriate time and long term maintenance of adequate on-site areas and infrastructure for the storage of cycles and charging of electrically assisted cycles in accordance with Suffolk Guidance for Parking (2023).

15. Prior to the first occupation of the new development the highway improvements detailed on submitted drawing numbers 1392/HWY/001 A to 1392/HWY/010 , shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved drawing. The works include, upgraded footways to 3m cycleways with at least 0.5m buffer from carriageway where possible between Yoxford village and Darsham Train Station, crossing points across A12 (lit to safety audit requirements) and junctions improvements.

Reason: To promote and facilitate access to sustainable transport modes and to provide safe and suitable access for all users in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework (Dec 2023) Para. 114 and Para. 116.

16. The gradient of the vehicular access shall not be steeper than 1 in 20 for the first five metres measured from the nearside edge of the highway.

Reason: To ensure that vehicles can enter and leave the public highway in a safe manner.

17. No part of the development shall be commenced until details of the proposed off-site highway improvements to include a formal signalised crossing of the A12 have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and SCC as the local highway authority. The approved scheme shall be laid out and constructed in its entirety prior to occupation.

Reason: To ensure that the necessary highway improvements are designed and constructed to an appropriate specification and made available for use at an appropriate time in the interests of highway safety and sustainable travel, this includes safe routes to schools and is required to safely cross children to access schools and use sustainable transport modes.

18. Before the access is first used visibility splays shall be provided as shown on Drawing No. 1392\_HWY\_002 with an X dimension of 2.4 metres and a Y dimension of 90m metres [tangential to the nearside edge of the carriageway] and thereafter retained in the specified form. Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 2 Class A of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (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.

19. No development above ground floor slab level of any part of the development hereby permitted shall take place until the travel arrangements to and from the site for residents of the dwellings, in the form of a Travel Plan in accordance with the mitigation measures identified in the Transport Assessment, and Highway Authority response shall be submitted for the approval in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with the highway authority. This Travel Plan must contain the following:

- Baseline travel data based upon the information provided in the Transport Assessment, with suitable measures, objectives and targets identified targets to reduce the vehicular trips made by residents across the whole development, with suitable remedial measures identified to be implemented if these objectives and targets are not met

- Appointment of Travel Plan Coordinator to implement the Travel Plan in full and clearly identify their contact details in the Travel Plan

- A commitment to monitor the vehicular trips generated by the residents using traffic counters and resident questionnaires and submit a revised (or Full) Travel Plan on occupation of the 100th dwelling

- A further commitment to monitor the Travel Plan annually on each anniversary of the approval of the Full Travel Plan and provide the outcome in a revised Travel Plan to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for a minimum of five years, or one year after occupation of the final dwelling (whichever is the longest duration) using the same methodology as the baseline monitoring

- A suitable marketing strategy to ensure that all residents on the site are engaged in the Travel Plan process

- A Travel Plan budget that covers the full implementation of the Travel Plan

- A copy of a residents travel pack that includes a multi-modal voucher to incentivise residents to use sustainable travel in the local area

No dwelling within the site shall be occupied until the Travel Plan has been agreed. The approved Travel Plan measures shall be implemented in accordance with a timetable that shall be included in the Travel Plan and shall thereafter adhered to in accordance with the approved Travel Plan.

Reason: In the interest of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF, and Policy SCLP7.1.

20. Concurrent with the submission of the first reserved matters application, a housing mix strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, in order to demonstrate how the proposed development will deliver an appropriate mix of dwellings across the development.

Reason: To ensure the development provides a mix of housing in accordance with policy SCLP5.8 (Housing Mix) of the East Suffolk Council - Suffolk Coastal Local Plan (2020).

21. No development shall take place within the area indicated [the whole site] until the implementation of a programme of archaeological work has been secured, in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation which has been submitted to and

approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The scheme of investigation shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:

- a. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording
- b. The programme for post investigation assessment
- c. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording
- d. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation
- e. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation
- f. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.
- g. The site investigation shall be completed prior to development, or in such other phased arrangement, as agreed and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard archaeological assets within the approved development boundary from impacts relating to any groundworks associated with the development scheme and to ensure the proper and timely investigation, recording, reporting and presentation of archaeological assets affected by this development, in accordance with Policy SCLP11.7 of Suffolk Coastal Local Plan (2020) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

22. No building shall be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed, submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under Condition 1 and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition.

Reason:

To safeguard archaeological assets within the approved development boundary from impacts relating to any groundworks associated with the development scheme and to ensure the proper and timely investigation, recording, reporting and presentation of archaeological assets affected by this development, in accordance with Policy SCLP11.7 of Suffolk Coastal Local Plan (2020) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

23. Concurrent with the first reserved matters application(s) a surface water drainage scheme shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority (LPA). The scheme shall be in accordance with the approved FRA and include:

- a. Dimensioned plans and drawings of the surface water drainage scheme;
- b. Further infiltration testing on the site in accordance with BRE 365 and the use of infiltration as the means of drainage if the infiltration rates and groundwater levels show it to be possible;
- c. If the use of infiltration is not possible then modelling shall be submitted to demonstrate that the surface water runoff will be restricted to  $Q_{bar}$  or 2l/s/ha for all events up to the critical 1 in 100 year rainfall events including climate change as

specified in the FRA;

d. Modelling of the surface water drainage scheme to show that the attenuation/infiltration features will contain the 1 in 100 year rainfall event including climate change;

e. Modelling of the surface water conveyance network in the 1 in 30 year rainfall event to show no above ground flooding, and modelling of the volumes of any above ground flooding from the pipe network in a 1 in 100 year rainfall event including climate change, along with topographic plans showing where the water will flow and be stored to ensure no flooding of buildings or offsite flows;

f. Topographical plans depicting all exceedance flow paths and demonstration that the flows would not flood buildings or flow offsite, and if they are to be directed to the surface water drainage system then the potential additional rates and volumes of surface water must be included within the modelling of the surface water system;

g. Details of the maintenance and management of the surface water drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

h. 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 and 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

The scheme shall be fully implemented as approved.

Reasons: To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage and disposal of surface water from the site for the lifetime of the development. To ensure the development does not cause increased flood risk, or pollution of watercourses or groundwater. To ensure clear arrangements are in place for ongoing operation and maintenance of the disposal of surface water drainage.

<https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/flooding-and-drainage/guidance-ondevelopment-and-flood-risk/construction-surface-water-management-plan/>

24. Within 28 days of practical completion of the last dwelling or unit, a Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) verification report shall be submitted to the LPA, detailing that the SuDS have been inspected, have been built and function in accordance with the approved designs and drawings. The report shall include details of all SuDS components and piped networks have been submitted, in an approved form, to and approved in writing by the LPA 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 within the county of Suffolk

<https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/flooding-and-drainage/flood-risk-asset-register/>

25. In the event that contamination which has not already been identified to the Local Planning Authority (LPA) is found or suspected on the site it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority.

No further development (including any construction, demolition, site clearance, removal of underground tanks and relic structures) shall take place until this condition has been complied with in its entirety.

An investigation and risk assessment must be completed in accordance with a scheme which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons and conform with prevailing guidance (including BS10175:2011+A2:2017 and the Land Contamination Risk Management (LCRM)) and a written report of the findings must be produced. The written report is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Where remediation is necessary a detailed remediation method statement (RMS) must be prepared, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The RMS must include detailed methodologies for all works to be undertaken, site management procedures, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria. The approved RMS must be carried out in its entirety and the Local Planning Authority must be given two weeks written notification prior to the commencement of the remedial works.

Following completion of the approved remediation scheme a validation report that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation must be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.

26. No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Statement shall provide for:

- a. parking and turning areas for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors;
- b. loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- c. storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
- d. provision and use of wheel washing facilities;

- e. provision of boundary hoarding and lighting;
- f. measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;
- g. a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works; and
- h. delivery, demolition and construction working hours.

The approved Construction Method Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period for the development.

Reason: In the interest of local amenity and protection of the environment during construction.

27. No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of hard and soft landscaping works for the site, which shall include any proposed changes in ground levels and also accurately identify spread, girth and species of all existing trees, shrubs and hedgerows on the site and indicate any to be retained, together with measures for their protection which shall comply with the recommendations set out in the British Standards Institute recommendation "BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations"

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and the character and appearance of the area.

28. The approved landscaping scheme (as approved by Condition 27) shall be implemented not later than the first planting season following commencement of the development (or within such extended period as the local planning authority may allow) and shall thereafter be retained and maintained for a period of five years. Any plant material removed, dying or becoming seriously damaged or diseased within five years of planting shall be replaced within the first available planting season and shall be retained and maintained.

Reason: To ensure the submission and implementation of a well-laid out scheme of landscaping in the interest of visual amenity.

29. As part of each reserved matters application for appearance, details of all external facing and roofing materials for all buildings shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development.

30. The hereby approved development shall include a provision for 50% of all dwellings to meet the requirements of M4(2) (or M4(3)) of the Building Regulations. Concurrent with each reserved matters application, details shall be provided specifying which dwelling(s) are M4(2) (or M4(3)) compliant and thereafter constructed in accordance with regulation requirements.

Reason: To ensure the development provides accessible and adaptable dwellings in accordance with Policy SCLP5.8 of the East Suffolk Council - Suffolk Coastal

Local Plan (2020).

31. Concurrent with each reserved matters application, a sustainability statement which demonstrates that sustainable construction methods have been incorporated into the development proposal, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In accordance with sustainable construction objectives of Policy SCLP9.2 of the East Suffolk Council - Suffolk Coastal Local Plan (2020).

32. Development must be undertaken in accordance with the ecological avoidance, mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures identified within the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) (Geosphere Environmental, July 2021); the Bat Scoping and Activity Survey Report (Geosphere Environmental, July 2021); the Biodiversity Net Gain Calculation Report (Geosphere Environmental, August 2021) and the Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment (sHRA) (Scott Properties, August 2021) as submitted with the planning application and agreed in principle with the local planning authority prior to determination.

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

33. No removal of hedgerows, trees or shrubs 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 should be submitted to the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that nesting birds are protected.

34. Commensurate with first Reserved Matters Application, a "lighting design strategy for biodiversity" for the site shall be 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 should 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.

35. A landscape and ecological management plan (LEMP) shall be submitted to, and be approved in writing by, the local planning authority prior to first occupation of the development. The content of the LEMP shall include the following:

- a) Description and evaluation of features to be managed.
- b) Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management.
- c) Aims and objectives of management.
- d) Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives.
- e) Prescriptions for management actions.
- f) Preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five-year period).
- g) Details of the body or organisation responsible for implementation of the plan.
- h) Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures.

The LEMP shall also include details of the legal and funding mechanism(s) by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer with the management body(ies) responsible for its delivery. The plan shall also set out (where the results from monitoring show that conservation aims and objectives of the LEMP are not being met) how contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme. The approved plan will be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the long-term ecological value of the site is maintained and enhanced.

36. Commensurate with the first Reserved Matters Application 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 will be delivered and retained in accordance with the approved Strategy.

Reason: To ensure that the development delivers ecological enhancements.

37. The Reserved Matters Application(s) must include an up to date ecological assessment of the site. The approved ecological measures secured through Condition 32 shall be reviewed and, where necessary, amended and updated in line with the up to date assessment. The review shall be informed by further ecological surveys commissioned to i) establish if there have been any changes in the presence and/or abundance of protected or UK Priority habitats and species and ii) identify any likely new ecological impacts that might arise from any changes.

Where the survey results indicate that changes have occurred that will result in ecological impacts not previously addressed in the approved scheme, the original

approved ecological measures will be revised and new or amended measures, and a timetable for their implementation, will be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of development. Works will then be carried out in accordance with the proposed new approved ecological measures and timetable.

Reason: To ensure that ecological mitigation measures are appropriately delivered based on up-to-date evidence.

38. Prior to the commencement of the use, the noise mitigation measures/construction methods will be implemented in accordance with the noise assessment 65203079-SWE-ZZ-XX-YA-0001 as has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Only the approved scheme shall be implemented and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity, in accordance with policy SCLP11.2 (Residential Amenity) of the East Suffolk Council - Suffolk Coastal Local Plan (2020).

39. Concurrent with the submission of the first reserved matters application, details of all walls (including retaining walls), fences, gates or other means of enclosure to be erected in or around the development have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. Thereafter, no occupation or use of the development shall take place until the walls (including retaining walls), fences, gates or other means of enclosure shall be erected as approved and shall thereafter be permanently retained and maintained.

Reason: To ensure that the finished appearance of the development will enhance the character and visual amenities of the area, and to satisfactorily protect the residential amenities of nearby/future occupiers.

40. Prior to the commencement of development, a scheme for the provision of fire hydrants shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented in its entirety prior to the occupation of the building. It shall thereafter be retained and maintained in its improved form.

Reason: In the interests of the safety of the future occupants of the hereby approved development.

## **7 DC/24/0695/FUL - Darsham Village Hall, Cheyney Green, Darsham, IP17 3FA**

The Committee received report ES/1948 of the Interim Joint Head of Planning which related to planning application DC/24/0695/FUL.

The application sought planning permission for the creation of a play area measuring

180sqm to the side of Darsham Village Hall. The application was before the Committee following the referral panel at the ward member's request due to the varying opinions within the Parish.

The Committee received a presentation from the Principal Planner who was the case officer for the application. The site's location plan and an aerial photograph were shared with the Committee.

Various site photographs were shown, highlighting the views into and from the proposed play area and the houses in the surrounding area. The Principal Planner noted the walkway in close proximity to the residential properties.

It was noted that this area was always earmarked for a play area and although details of the play area were not approved within the reserve matters application a financial contribution was secured. One of the main concerns raised was that the area allocated as a local area for play on the plans was 105sqm which is smaller than the proposed 180sqm.

The proposed layout of the play equipment was displayed and the Principal Planner highlighted the main concern was with one piece of equipment particularly due to the size, scale and impact and the age of the children potentially using it.

The application also proposed hedging around the main boundary and a pedestrian access at the end of the main cul-de-sac.

The guidance in terms of the distance required between play equipment and residential properties was shared and the Principal Planner confirmed that the Council's sport and leisure team had reviewed it and considered it to be a LAP (local area for play).

Illustration of the play equipment were shared with the Committee and the material planning considerations were summarised as principle of development, design and visual impact and impact on residential amenity.

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

The Chair invited questions from the Committee.

In response to Councillor Smithson, the Principal Planner confirmed that the roundabout and swing were accessible.

In response to Councillor Ashton, the Principal Planner confirmed that the application was for the equipment demonstrated and this would be the equipment that would be required to be installed.

There being no further questions, the Chair invited Mr Meggison, objector, to speak.

Mr Meggison, objector, read out the following statement:

“We are in support of a play area for the village. We are not, however, in support of this application due to the increase in size and scale from the plans from which the residents bought their houses, and also because this application does not comply with the National and East Suffolk Councils guidelines with regard to the siting and make up of play areas.

This application is now apparently for a LAP – a Local Area for Play.

A LAP is for accompanied children aged 4 – 6 with small equipment, ‘discouraging use by older children’ and for use by children within one minutes walk from home – this comes from East Suffolk Council’s very own adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance, SPG 15, - meaning it is a material consideration when making planning decisions. However, several items of equipment in this application are for children up to the age of 12 and 14.

Fields in Trust are the national authority for playground guidelines. SPG15 was based on their guidance. Fields in Trust have told us that it is the age range of the equipment, not the size of the area that determines whether a play area is classified as a LAP, LEAP or NEAP.

LEAPs are for children up to 8 with a minimum buffer zone of 20 metres. NEAPs are for children up to 14 with a buffer zone of 30 metres.

We asked Fields in Trust “if a play area of 200 sqm has equipment aimed at older children does it then become a 'NEAP', regardless of its size?” The answer was categorically ‘yes’. I have the email to prove it. This application has various items of equipment for children up to 14.

The case officers report states: “The proposed play tower, while it is of a noticeable height, would not be so large as to adversely impact on outlook from the windows of neighbouring properties.”

Yes, it is most certainly of noticeable height – it is 3.65 metres tall. How much bigger would it have to be before it would adversely impact on outlook?! This tower will enable users to look straight through our lounge window, not from street level but from a raised platform.

In addition, the proposed basket swing is also aimed at children up to 14 and SPG15 actually states ‘Young teenagers prefer large group swings’.

The required buffer zone is not in compliance with the guidance because there is effectively no buffer zone, just an area of meadow grass that will become an extension of the play area right up to the boundary fence affecting the residential amenity of residents.

We cannot believe the officers report is recommending approval in total disregard of SPG 15. You cannot recommend approval for a play area just because a village doesn’t have one and you think it would be a good idea.

The council has guidelines for building play areas for very good reason, to protect residents living close by as well as providing good play facilities, so surely they must be followed.

We would ask that you reject this proposal and suggest that the Village Hall Committee actually consult the nearby residents to achieve a compromise.”

The Chair invited questions to Mr Meggison.

Councillor Ashton asked for clarification on the buffer zone and why it was problematic. Mr Meggison confirmed it didn't comply with guidance as there was no buffer zone due to it being meadow grass, adding it would just be an extension of the play area with children playing up to the fence.

Councillor Smithson asked if Mr Meggison objected to the play area or were they wanting a play area for children up to age 6. Mr Meggison confirmed they were not against it and the play area could have been more suitable situated in the middle of the village green. Mr Meggison added the buffer zone should be there to protect residential amenity.

Councillor Graham asked if they would be happier if the play area contained equipment for younger children. Mr Meggison confirmed they would they bought the house knowing there would be a LAP and were happy with it but the plans were now for equipment for children of up to 14 years of age, which was unfair for the residents of Cheyney Green.

Councillor Smithson noted that all new play areas should have some form of accessible equipment and understood that older children using younger children's equipment is a nuisance, however they questioned what there was for the young teenagers in the village. Mr Meggison agreed there wasn't anything for them in the village, however he was representing the residents of Cheyney Green and questioned why the village green location wasn't suggested. In response the Chair confirmed that the Committee had to consider the application that was in front of them and decide.

There being no further questions, the Chair invited Heather Ballantine of Darsham Village Hall Management Committee to speak.

Heather Ballantine told the Committee that the village of Darsham had doubled in size in the past ten years and as part of that growth they now have 30 children in the village which they didn't have earlier. The management committee has responsibility of organising activities from the village and as part of the new village hall, a play area was part of the designs for Cheyney Green. The developer declined to provide this and elected to provide Section 106 funding for the village to access. Committee have taken on responsibility of play area. Carried out a village wide consultation to obtain planning permission. A working group was set up but it was not functioning as it should despite interventions so it was taken back into control of the Darsham Village Hall Management Committee who looked at best value for money accessing public funding. Two sizes were put forward and this shared with whole village. This is done by whole village consultation for the size of the area and the suggested landscaping and planting plan was shared with the residents of Cheyney Green. The majority of consultees were in favour of the larger area, before suggesting this was an option the 20 metre rule for the play area was marked out and seemed to be a possibility. Fields in Trust have been consulted and consider the play area to be a LAP. The specification for the age range 4-8 were sent to several companies and the plans shared at an open

evening for whole village to attend. All comments were taken into account and the final specification was sent to the preferred supplier. In reference to the objection of the size of the tower, Heather Ballantine stated that the actual platform was 1.5m and not 3.65m as stated. The tower is enclosed at a height of 2.7m with a distance of 33m from the tower to 16 Cheyney Green, meaning overlooking is not the material consideration it was made to be. The meadow grass idea came from villagers and would be used to educate children on the environment. The majority of families with small children support the play area. In summary taken planning advice, consulted with community, followed outdoor play area advice, looked to provide a play area that has a sports element as well as accessibility for those children that need it. The committee had looked to provide the most suitable sustainable solution that meets the needs of the village.

The Chair invited questions to Heather Ballantine.

Councillor Ashton stated the soil in Darsham was extremely heavy clay and therefore aware of the challenges, asking was the location of the village green considered. Heather Ballantine replied that the village green was ex agricultural ground and very uneven so it wasn't a possibility, plus it was on the outline planning permission in the proposed location.

It was confirmed the following accessible play equipment would be installed, floor level roundabout, basket swing and noughts and crosses game.

There being no further questions the Chair invited the Committee to debate the application.

Councillor Ashton in summing up stated that it would have been much more preferable if a solution was found as the application has caused discontinuity. Noting that the objectors didn't object to the principle of the play area but more the location of it. Referring to the objections and potential nuisance from older children, Councillor Ashton understood that it was a risk, and recognised that this could happen from them congregating irrespective of the age range of the equipment installed. Councillor Ashton had visited the area to view the potential of overlooking and confirmed they could not see into the properties, whilst sympathetic, they would support the application.

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

RESOLVED

That the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: This condition is imposed 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 Caloo Product Data Sheet, Elevations E.3 and proposed Block Plan GA1 all received 23 February 2024 and Site Plan received 29 February 2024, 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 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. Within 3 months of commencement of development, satisfactory precise details of the hedge planting scheme (which shall include species, size and numbers of plants to be planted) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure the submission and implementation of a well-laid out scheme of landscaping in the interest of visual amenity.

## **8 DC/24/0415/FUL - Box Bush, Seven Acres Lane, Walberswick, IP18 6UL**

Agenda items 8 and 9 were presented jointly.

The Committee received reports ES/1949 and ES/1950 of the Interim Joint Head of Planning which related to planning applications DC/24/0415/FUL and DC/24/0416/LBC.

The applications sought planning permission and listed building consent for a new dormer window, alterations to fenestration and internal layout, general repairs to existing fabric and insulation on external walls and roof. The application was before the Committee to consider the views of the Parish Council.

The Committee received a presentation from the Assistant Planner who was the case officer for the application.

An aerial photograph showing the site in context was shared with the committee along with the site location plan. A series of photographs were shown, highlighting the key proposals and the property's current state. The assistant planner noted that the property was a listed building designed by Jennings built in 1938. The property was listed in 2023.

Proposed internal plans were shown to the Committee along with the existing and proposed elevations. The material planning considerations were summarised as biodiversity, landscape character and design quality, residential amenity and listed building.

The Chair invited questions from the Committee to the Assistant Planner.

Councillor Ashton commented on the intended outside insulation and render which would leave the windows and doors recessed. The Assistant Planner confirmed that the reveals would be deeper on the inside but in line on the outside and not necessarily considered out of character.

In response to a question regarding the internal layout, the assistant planner confirmed that the proposals were to accommodate the client's requirements for alterations to the space.

There being no further questions, the Chair invited Councillor Lewis of Walberswick Parish Council to speak.

Councillor Lewis confirmed all comments related to both the Planning and Listed Building Consent. The current scheme put forward after the building was listed in 2023 proposed more alterations than significantly more loss of fabric than the previous scheme. The changes are stated as minimal but in their opinion they are not and the opinion of the Parish Council, the Suffolk Preservation Society and the 20th Century Society the application meets the criteria for partial demolition under sub-sections A and B of the arrangement for handling heritage applications and Secretary of State England directions 2021. Councillor Lewis stated if the alterations were to go ahead it would no longer meet the criteria for listing and therefore would not be a scheme that proposed or enhanced the property. The loss of listing building status which only occurred one year ago would be a shocking act of architectural vandalism in their view. Councillor Lewis stated that all the consultees had not been consulted with and the report submitted is misleading and has a number of shortcomings. The Parish Council believes that the applicant requires a bat licence as a protected species and that will take many months. The Parish council does not wish to delay the works they just wish the application to be withdrawn and a more sympathetic proposal brought forward. Councillor Lewis stated the Heritage Impact assessment was flawed and did not consider the 1938 Jennings elements.

The Chair invited questions to Councillor Lewis.

It was confirmed the building was Grade II listed. The Senior Design and Heritage Officer confirmed that the 20th Century Society were aware of the application and could have provided comments. They confirmed that they had reviewed the application in full and the significance of this building related mainly to the timber frame, which was all Suffolk salvaged material. The Senior Design and Heritage Officer confirmed the changes were numerous but minor, and the cement render was not original to the building.

There being no further questions, the Chair invited the applicant, Andrew Derrick, to speak.

The applicant told the Committee that he was the author of the Heritage Impact assessment that accompanies the application as well as a historic buildings inspector for 20 years for English Heritage. The Committee were told that the owner wants to improve the building, and the only objection was from the Parish Council. Regarding

the dormer, it was explained the low height over the staircase meant that you have to crouch down, so rather than move stairs a dormer was built. The applicant noted that all of Jennings' qualities would be preserved, and traditional lime render would be applied. The windows will be repaired and reused and flush with the front when reinstalled. The plans were very sympathetic from the outside and the Design and Heritage Officer was very happy with it.

The Chair invited questions to the applicant.

In response to Councillor Pitchers, the applicant confirmed that the alterations would not cause it to be de-listed and everything would improve the building and in the Jennings tradition of recycled building, nothing of any value would be thrown away it would be incorporated.

There being no further questions, the Chair invited the Committee to debate the application.

Councillor Back commented that what was being proposed would ensure the survival of the building, which was important for Walberswick and architecturally, adding he understood that concrete render was not breathable and the lime would secure longevity.

Councillor Ashton had a reservation with the reason for change but was happy to support the proposal.

On the proposition of Councillor Back, seconded by Councillor Ashdown 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 not later than the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: This condition is imposed 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 submitted Design and Access Statement and drawing nos. 204 PL 001, 110,111,115,116 and 120; received 05.02.2024; and revised drawing no. 204 PL 121B; received 08.04.2024; 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. No works to the second floor which may kill, injure or disturb bats or damage or destroy a bat roost, shall in any circumstances commence unless the Local Planning Authority has been provided with either:

a) a licence issued by Natural England pursuant to The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2017) (as amended) authorising the specified development to go ahead or demonstration that the appropriate Natural England Class Licence is in place to allow works to commence; or

b) a statement in writing from the relevant licensing body to the effect that it does not consider that the specified development will require a licence.

Reason: To ensure that the legislation relating to protected species has been adequately addressed as part of the implementation of the development.

5. No building work shall commence on the items below until details of the following have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:

1. Specification of new roof tiles
2. Full details of the porch
3. Full details of the new fenestration
4. Section through the bathroom ceiling
5. Specification of the bricks for the plinth - panel on site

Thereafter, all work must be carried out using the approved materials and in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that any new detailing and materials will not harm the traditional/historic character of the building: the application does not include the necessary details for consideration.

## **9 DC/24/0416/LBC - Box Bush, Seven Acres Lane, Walberswick, IP18 6UL**

The presentation for item 9 was minuted jointly with item 8 of the agenda.

There being no questions or debate, the Chair invited the Committee to vote on the listed building application.

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

RESOLVED

That the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: This condition is imposed in accordance with Section 18 of the Act (as amended).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in all respects strictly in accordance with the submitted Design and Access Statement and drawing nos. 204 PL 001, 110,111,115,116 and 120; received 05.02.2024; and revised drawing no. 204 PL 121B; received 08.04.2024; 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. No building work shall commence on each of the items below until details of the following have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:

1. Specification of new roof tiles
2. Full details of the porch
3. Full details of the new fenestration
4. Section through the bathroom ceiling
5. Specification of the bricks for the plinth - panel on site

Thereafter, all work must be carried out using the approved materials and in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that any new detailing and materials will not harm the traditional/historic character of the building: the application does not include the

necessary details for consideration.

That the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions

**10 DC/24/0394/ADN - Oulton Country Park, Lime Avenue, Oulton, Suffolk**

The Committee received reports ES/1951 of the Interim Joint Head of Planning which related to planning applications DC/24/0394/ADN. The application sought non-illuminated advertisement consent for the erection of a flagpole at Oulton Country Park.

The location plan and aerial photograph of the site was shared with the Committee with the Principal Planner demonstrating the exact location of the flagpole. It was pointed out that the site was owned by the Council and was a really valued asset for the Woods Meadow community and the wider community. The flagpole was to fly the Green Flag which has been awarded to the park and open space. The material planning considerations were summarised as location/appearance and public safety.

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

There being no questions or debate the Chair invited the Committee to vote on the application.

On the proposition of Councillor Ashdown, seconded by Councillor Back it was by a unanimous vote

RESOLVED

That the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. All advertisements displayed, and any land used for the display of advertisements, shall be maintained in a clean and tidy condition to the reasonable satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: As required by the Town and Country (Control of Advertisement) Regulations in force at this time.

2. All advertisements displayed, and any land used for the display of advertisements, shall be maintained in a clean and tidy condition to the reasonable

satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: As required by the Town and Country (Control of Advertisement) Regulations in force at this time.

3. Where any advertisement is required under these Regulations to be removed, the removal thereof shall be carried out to the reasonable satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: As required by the Town and Country (Control of Advertisement) Regulations in force at this time.

4. The development hereby permitted shall be completed in all respects strictly in accordance with the flagpole location plan and Specification details, 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.

The meeting concluded at 5:25 PM.

.....  
Chair