

Unconfirmed



Minutes of a Meeting of the **Planning Committee South** held in the Deben Conference Room, East Suffolk House, Melton, on **Tuesday, 22 October 2019 at 2:00 pm**

Members of the Committee present:

Councillor Stuart Bird, Councillor Chris Blundell, Councillor Tony Cooper, Councillor Tony Fryatt, Councillor Colin Hedgley, Councillor Debbie McCallum, Councillor Kay Yule

Other Members present:

Councillor James Mallinder, Councillor Chris Mapey, Councillor David Ritchie, Councillor Rachel Smith-Lyte

Officers present:

Liz Beighton (Planning Development Manager), Grant Heal (Area Planning & Enforcement Officer), Matt Makin (Democratic Services Manager), Philip Ridley (Head of Planning & Coastal Management), Jane Rodens (Area Planning & Enforcement), Katherine Scott (Development Management Team Leader), Natalie Webb (Area Planning & Enforcement Officer)

Others present:

Ben Chester (Suffolk County Council Highways)

1 Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

When opening the meeting, the Chairman advised that she had re-ordered the agenda in order to bring forward items with public speaking; items 7 and 8 were to be heard before item 6. She also noted that a site visit in respect of item 6 on the agenda had been undertaken the previous day (21 October 2019) and that all members of the Committee present, including substitutes, had attended the visit.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Allen and Deacon.

Councillor Coulam substituted for Councillor Allen and Councillor Gooch substituted for Councillor Deacon.

2 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Hedgley declared a Local Non-Pecuniary Interest in Item 8 of the agenda as a member of Great Bealings Parish Council.

3 Declarations of Lobbying and Responses to Lobbying

Councillor Fryatt declared that he had been lobbied by telephone regarding item 6 of the agenda and had not discussed the application with callers.

Councillor Gooch declared that she had been forwarded two letters by Councillor Deacon, for whom she was substituting, lobbying on item 6 of the agenda. She had read the emails but had not discussed them with anyone.

Councillor Yule declared that she had been approached by local residents in her Ward in respect of item 6 of the agenda, in person and by email.

Councillor Hedgley declared that he had received three emails asking him to vote against approving the planning application at item 6 of the agenda. He also declared that he had received an email in respect of item 8 of the agenda, from the applicant, inviting him to visit the application site. He confirmed that he had declined the invitation.

Councillor Cooper declared that he had received telephone calls, messages and emails relating to item 6 of the agenda. He said that he had only acknowledged contact.

Councillor Blundell declared that he had received emails on item 6 of the agenda but had not responded to them.

Councillor Bird declared that he had received emails on items 6 and 8 of the agenda but had not responded to them.

Councillor McCallum declared that she had received emails on item 6 of the agenda but had not responded to them.

Councillor Mapey declared that he had received emails on item 6 of the agenda and had been non-committal in his responses.

Councillor Smith-Lyte declared that she had received emails on item 6 of the agenda and had responded to some of them.

4 Minutes

RESOLVED

That the Minutes of the Meeting held on 24 September 2019 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

5 East Suffolk Enforcement Action - Case Update

The Committee received report **ES/0144** of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management. The report was a summary of the status of all outstanding enforcement cases for the Council where enforcement action had been sanctioned under delegated powers up until 23 September 2019. The report was received as read.

The Chairman invited questions to the Planning officers.

A member of the Committee who was Ward Member for Martlesham and Purdis Farm asked for an update on the enforcement case at Top Street, Martlesham, noting that it had been delayed. The Planning Development Manager said that she believed an appeal had been lodged and would ensure that the case officer provided a full update to the Ward Member.

RESOLVED

That the contents of the report be received and noted.

7 DC/19/3098/COU - The Firs, The Street, Hacheston, Woodbridge, IP13 0DR

The Committee received report **ES/0179** of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, which related to planning application DC/19/3098/COU.

The application sought the change of land to accommodate six motor homes to let out as part of a business. The land was within the curtilage of The Pines, was to the south of the host dwelling, in the Village of Hacheston and its Physical Limits Boundary.

The application was before the Committee having been considered by the Referral Panel as Hacheston Parish Council had objected to the application and the Planning Officer was recommending approval. The Referral Panel considered that the application should be determined by the Committee as it was a retrospective planning application and should therefore be given a hearing by the Committee.

The Committee received a presentation on the application from the Area Planning and Enforcement Officer. The site's location was outlined and the current block plan was shown to demonstrate how the business had been operating. The current block plan was compared to the proposed block plan.

Photographs of the site were displayed which showed the parking area, motor homes within the site, and views looking back to the main road.

The recommendations, as set out in the report, were outlined to the Committee.

The Chairman invited questions to the Planning officers.

The Area Planning and Enforcement Officer confirmed that the application had not included external lighting.

The Chairman invited Mr Revill, Chairman of Hacheston Parish Council, to address the Committee.

Mr Revill explained that Hacheston Parish Council objected to the application and considered it was inappropriate development in a residential area. He noted that the site was on the B1116 road which ran through the village of Hacheston, stating that the road carried approximately 5,000 vehicles a day at an average speed of 35 miles per hour. He added that the nearby shops to the site were also served by the layby and that these shops were a focal point in the village.

Mr Revill highlighted that the proposed parking site was within 20 metres of the River Ore which was in a Special Landscape Area. He said that Hacheston Parish Council was concerned about the pollution the motor homes would cause to this location.

it was acknowledged by Mr Revill that the applicant had addressed some of the concerns relating to the emptying of chemical toilets but said that concerns still remained. He also expressed concern about the risk of fire in a vehicle compound and the use of gas cylinders for the motor homes, querying if this was in line with gas safety regulations.

It was considered that if the layby was used by the business this would limit parking for those wishing to access local shops and impact traffic entering the B1116 at that location. He suggested that a more suitable site should be considered for this development.

Mr Revill concluded by saying that if the Committee was minded to approve the application, it should include conditions to restrict operating hours, to ensure that the chemical toilet waste disposal system was installed immediately, to prevent parking in the layby, and to ensure that the motor homes entered and exited the site in a forward gear.

The Chairman invited questions to Mr Revill.

The Vice-Chairman queried Mr Revill's statement on gas safety regulations. Mr Revill acknowledged that he was not an expert in this area but that when the Parish Council had become aware of the use of gas cylinders on the site, research undertaken had led him to conclude that gas safety regulations would be applicable in this instance, especially as the business was hiring out the motor homes with gas cylinders included.

Mr Revill confirmed that there had been local objections to the proposed scheme and that significant correspondence had been submitted on the applicant's original application which had been withdrawn.

The Chairman invited Mr Allison, the applicant, to address the Committee.

Mr Allison apologised to the Committee for making a retrospective planning application. He explained that he had not originally set out to establish the business and had not realised that planning permission was required. He explained that he had moved back to Hacheston to care for an elderly relative and had first bought a motor home for personal use; the first vehicle purchased was not suitable so he bought a larger motor home and decided to hire out the original vehicle.

Mr Allison confirmed that he now owned six motor home vehicles, which varied in size and capacity, hiring them out for a source of income. He thanked the Area Planning and Enforcement Officer for her work on his case and said that he would be happy to answer the Committee's questions.

The Chairman invited questions to Mr Allison.

The Chairman asked Mr Allison if he would be installing the waste system for chemical toilets as soon as possible. Mr Allison said that as winter was approaching, it was his intention to install a waste tank in April 2020 as the vehicles were not currently in use.

Mr Allison stated that a motor home vehicle had only been parked in the layby once in the last year. He said he took exception to being told he could not park in a layby outside of his own property.

It was confirmed that all vehicles were arranged so that they could leave the site in a forward gear. Mr Allison considered that he was unable to control his customers choosing to turn the vehicle around and reverse off the site if they chose to do so. He ensured that all gas supplies were turned off as required.

A member of the Committee asked Mr Allison if it was necessary to operate his business on a 24/7 basis. Mr Allison noted that his business was a leisure one and wanted to be able to accommodate a wide variety of return times. He said that he did not work seven days a week.

It was noted that the motor home vehicles were hired to tour the local area, with bookings often being made for the Latitude Festival.

Another member of the Committee asked if Mr Allison would be willing to include conditions in the hire terms and conditions to require his customers to not park in the layby or reverse in and out of the site. Mr Allison reiterated that the vehicles were prepared for collection facing the right way to leave the site in a forward gear and that any parking in the layby would be temporary.

The Chairman invited the Committee to debate the application that was before it. She opened debate by noting the concerns of the Parish Council and that the Referral Panel had recommended the application be determined by Committee as it was a retrospective application. She considered that, having listened to the applicant, the issues with the application had been resolved, highlighting that there had been no third-party comments on the application. She said that she would be voting in favour of the application.

There being no further debate, the Chairman moved to the recommendation as set out in the report.

On the proposition of Councillor Cooper, seconded by Councillor Blundell it was by unanimous vote

RESOLVED

That the application be **APPROVED** Subject to Conditions set out in the report and an additional condition requiring the installation of the underground tank for chemical toilet waste prior to the end of March 2020.

Plans

1. The development hereby permitted shall be completed in all respects strictly in accordance with DS1220, 1905/1A, 1905/2A and 1905/3A received 6th August 2019,

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.

Business use and dwelling tied

2. This site shall only be used as a dwelling (currently known as 'The Firs') with associated land within the red line on drawing 1905/1A being used for the hiring of motorhomes business being operated by the owners and/or occupiers of 'The Firs', and for no other purpose. In the event that the motorhome hire business ceases, within 3 months, all material and equipment bought on to the site in connection with the motorhome hire business shall be removed (apart from the septic tank/water treatment system).

Reason: In the interests of safeguarding the amenity of future occupiers of 'The Firs'. The Local Planning Authority would not grant consent for this business use in such close proximity to a residential unit, unless they are interconnected.

Number of vehicles

3. A maximum of 6 motor homes and 2 cars (8 vehicles on site) are to be located within defined parking area as defined on drawing 1905/3A at one time. No other vehicles shall be parked anywhere else on site (i.e. anywhere outside the defined parking area, within the red line on drawing 1905/1A), unless otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, and in the interests of highway safety.

Hours of Use

4. The motorhomes shall only be collected, returned, cleaned and moved within the site between the hours of 8am and 6pm each day (including bank holidays).

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Use/Activities

5. The only activities to be undertaken to the motorhomes on site shall be cleaning (including emptying of chemical and grey water, washing of exterior and interior cleaning such as hoovering, changing bedding etc). No vehicle repairs or replacement of mechanical parts or vehicle sales shall be undertaken on site.

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Lighting - No external

6. No external lighting shall be installed on the site or affixed to any buildings on the site unless the Local Planning Authority has first approved details of the position, height, design, angle of fittings and luminance level. The lighting shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and maintained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and biodiversity

7. The underground tank as identified on plan 1905/3A is to be installed prior to the 31st March 2020, unless otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: to ensure that the development indicated on the plans is carried out in a satisfactory time scale.

8 DC/19/2700/FUL - Croft Cottage, Lower Street, Great Bealings, IP13 6NH

The Committee received report **ES/0180** of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, which related to planning application DC/19/2700/FUL.

Planning permission was sought for a replacement dwelling at Croft Cottage, Lower Street, Great Bealings. The site was positioned towards the northern extremity of Great Bealings, which was an 'Other Village' where replacement dwellings were considered acceptable, provided they were no more visually intrusive.

The Committee received a presentation on the application from the Area Planning and Enforcement Officer. The site's location was outlined; the Committee was advised that the plot of the existing dwelling was a large one and was on the edge of a cluster of dwellings to the north of Great Bealings. The existing dwelling was described as a modest three-bedroom property with well vegetated boundaries. The topography of the site sloped from the front of the dwelling to the rear of the plot.

The existing block plan was outlined. The Area Planning and Enforcement Officer highlighted that the footprint of the proposed dwelling was larger than that of the existing dwelling but was considered proportionate to the size of the plot.

The proposed floor plans were highlighted. It was confirmed that the new dwelling would also be a three-bedroom property with living accommodation on the first floor. There would also be a terrace on the western elevation of the building.

The proposed elevations were displayed. The aesthetic of the proposed dwelling was described as being contemporary and the ridge height was confirmed to be 1.5 metres lower than that of the existing dwelling.

The Committee was shown photographs which displayed the street scene looking down Lower Street to the east and up Lower Street to the west.

The recommendations, as set out in the report, were outlined to the Committee.

There being no questions to the Planning officers, the Chairman invited Mr Barrington, representing Great Bealings Parish Council, to address the Committee.

Mr Barrington advised that Great Bealings Parish Council objected to the application. He said that the Great Bealings Neighbourhood Plan had been designed to enhance and protect the village and noted that the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan defined it as being part of the countryside and that this was not proposed to be changed in the emerging Local Plan.

Mr Barrington added that the development was within a landscape protection area and was adjacent to non-designated heritage assets. He considered the design aesthetic proposed to be inappropriate given its proximity to these assets.

The site was described as being near the gateway to Great Bealings and part of the boundary between the countryside and the built environment. For that reason, Mr Barrington said that the Parish Council considered the proposed dwelling inappropriate for the setting as it would be intrusive.

Mr Barrington stated that the significant change in visual impact that would be caused was against the Council's policies as set out in the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan. He disagreed with the assertion that the site was within a physical limits boundary as there was no such boundary due to the village being in the countryside.

It was highlighted that the ground plan of the proposed dwelling was larger than what existed and Mr Barrington was of the opinion that any new development should be within scale, noting that the benefit of a lower ridge height came at the price of a larger footprint. He also noted that the proposed building would be two metres closer to the old post office and was unsure as to why this was.

The Chairman invited questions to Mr Barrington.

A member of the Committee sought further clarification from Mr Barrington on how the proposed dwelling would be visually intrusive. He stated that it was a question of judgement and that, in the opinion of the Parish Council, the proposed development would be out of keeping with the neighbouring non-designated heritage assets as it would be of a dramatically different style.

The Vice-Chairman queried if the Parish Council considered that the design was in keeping with neighbouring properties. Mr Barrington said that the neighbouring properties had sloping roofs at the rear and that the view of the street scene demonstrated did not give a full impact of the situation.

The meeting was adjourned for a short break at 2.41 pm. It was reconvened at 2.43 pm.

The Chairman invited Mr Turner, the applicant, to address the Committee.

Mr Turner advised that he had emailed members of the Committee to invite them to visit the application site, in order to avoid the application being deferred at Committee for such a visit. He said that the proposed dwelling had been designed by local architectural companies that had a good knowledge of the local area. He considered that similar designs existed in the local area and highlighted both the three letters of support submitted and the lack of objections from the Highways Authority.

The larger footprint of the new building was acknowledged by Mr Turner. He said that the proposed dwelling had been designed in such a way to avoid overlooking neighbours. He was of the opinion that the footprint would be in keeping with neighbouring properties and was, in fact, smaller than some existing properties nearby.

The design was described as making the most of glass, timber cladding and render. The dwelling would overlook the countryside and have a sloping roof.

Mr Turner stated that the current dwelling was not considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. He noted that the Great Bealings Neighbourhood Plan supported replacement dwellings and said that the existing building had been described as an eyesore. Mr Turner said that Lower Street was not the main through road into the village and that the new dwelling would not be visible to traffic.

Mr Turner concluded by saying that he believed the application was in accordance with planning policies and should be approved, considering it to be of a high quality design that would improve the area.

There being no questions to Mr Turner, the Chairman invited the Committee to debate the application that was before it.

A member of the Committee, who was Ward Member for Great Bealings, opened debate. He acknowledged that progress needed to be made in planning but said that change should be managed and considered in a careful way. He said that he was not opposed to the design proposed but was concerned that the dwelling would be in full view when entering the village and had concerns about the impact on the street scene.

The Vice-Chairman, who was also Ward Member for Great Bealings, sympathised with the views of the Parish Council and acknowledged that the site location was a key aspect of the entrance to Great Bealings. He said that he had originally been shocked by the design proposed but having been able to put it into context, was able to accept such a design on the site.

Another member of the Committee highlighted that architecture had evolved throughout history and that the site was not within an AONB or conservation area and was not adjacent to any listed buildings. He was mindful that the new building would be lower in height than the one that was currently on the site. He considered that a new design should be accepted as part of the village's evolutionary process and said that he would be supporting the application.

A member of the Committee stated that she had been concerned about the proposed rendering, but having driven past the site considered this aspect acceptable. She was pleased to see the site being taken on and improved and said that this ought to be encouraged. She was of the view that the applicant had been conservative with the proposal and had considered the impact on residential amenity.

The Chairman concluded debate by stating that she considered the existing cottage needed to be replaced and was in favour of the application before the Committee.

There being no further debate, the Chairman moved to the recommendation set out in the report.

On the proposition of Councillor Bird, seconded by Councillor Coulam it was by a majority vote

RESOLVED

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

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

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

2. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out other than in complete accordance with the following approved drawings:

- 6171 (OS Map);
- 6171 1 (Block Plan);
- 6171 2 (Details plans, sections and elevations);
- Proposed finishes (Received 5 July 2019).

Reason: For 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 by the local planning authority.

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

4. No construction work, including demolition and deliveries to and from site, shall commence before 8am and shall not continue after 6pm Monday to Friday and 8am to 1pm on Saturdays with none being undertaken Sundays and bank holidays unless otherwise agreed by the local planning authority.

Reasons: To prevent noise pollution to adjacent residential properties.

5. Within 6 weeks of the hereby approved dwelling being occupied, the mobile home illustrated on approved drawing 6171 1 (Block Plan) shall be removed in its entirety, unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that there would be no more than 1 dwelling on the site, in the interests of residential amenity and because the site lies within the countryside, where additional dwelling houses are only permitted in exceptional circumstances.

6. Within 3 month(s) of commencement of development, precise details of a scheme of landscape works (which term shall include tree and shrub planting, grass, earthworks, driveway construction, parking areas patios, hard surfaces etc, and other operations as appropriate) at a scale not less than 1:200 shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that there is a well laid out landscaping scheme in the interest of visual amenity.

7. The approved landscaping works 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 5 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.

8. Prior to the flat roof terrace being used as a balcony for the purposes incidental the enjoyment of the approved dwelling house, the hereby approved glass panels shall be erected along the sides of the roof. The panels shall thereafter be retained in the approved form unless otherwise agreed by the local planning authority.

Reason: To safeguard the privacy of neighbouring residents.

9. 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. Unless agreed in writing by the LPA 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 BS 10175:2011+A1:2013 and CLR11) 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.

10. Notwithstanding the provisions of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 or any Order revoking or re-enacting the said Order] no development comprising the installation of windows on the new dwelling's east and rearfacing elevations, or development comprising additions and alterations to the proposed dwelling's roof, including the proposed first floor terrace shall be carried out unless otherwise agreed with the local planning authority.

Reason: In order that the local planning authority may retain control over this particular form of development in the interests of amenity and the protection of the local environment and the amenity of adjoining resident.

The meeting was adjourned for a break at 2.53 pm. It was reconvened at 3.10 pm.

6 DC/19/2641/FUL - Former Council Offices, Melton Hill, Woodbridge, IP12 1AU

The Committee received report **ES/0178** of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, which related to planning application DC/19/2641/FUL.

Planning Permission was sought for the redevelopment of the former Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC) Offices site to a residential led scheme of 100 dwellings, of which 32 were proposed to be affordable housing. The proposal also included community and café space towards the site frontage, pedestrian thoroughfare through to the river and underground parking.

This was the third application for the site. The first application (reference DC/17/2840/FUL) was withdrawn at the applicant's request, following a resolution to approve by the SCDC Planning Committee in April 2018. A revised application was submitted (application reference DC/18/3424/FUL refers) for an identical scheme but seeking to utilise Vacant Building Credit (VBC) to reduce the level of affordable housing provision to 16.

That application was refused by the SCDC Planning Committee on the 26 November 2018 in accordance with the officer recommendation relating solely to the Vacant Building Credit issue, and in all other respects the scheme was the same as that previously considered. The applicants appealed the decision and formal determination of the appeal was awaited from the Planning Inspectorate and the consideration was via the written representation route.

The current application sought to make some minor amendments to the layout and appearance of the site from the previously considered schemes. The general design ethos of the development remained the same and the scheme made provision for the policy requirement affordable housing.

The Committee received a presentation on the application from the Planning Development Manager. She outlined the planning history of the site as detailed in the report's Executive Summary and notified the Committee that the decision of the Planning Inspectorate, regarding the appeal against the decision to refuse application DC/18/3424/FUL, was expected to be issued in the near future.

The Committee's attention was drawn to comments received comparing the proposed scheme against an alternative affordable housing scheme in Norwich; the Planning

Development Manager reminded the Committee that it was determining the application that was before it and not any alternative scheme suggested by commentators on the application.

Reference was made to the site visit undertaken by the Committee on 21 October 2019, which replicated the site visit undertaken by the SCDC Planning Committee in 2017.

The Planning Development Manager highlighted the changes made to the current scheme compared to previous applications, as detailed in paragraph 3.9 of the report. She described the application as being very similar to the first application on the site, that SCDC Planning Committee resolved to approve in April 2018.

re

It was noted that the emerging Suffolk Coastal Local Plan, which had recently been examined by the Planning Inspectorate, had allocated the site for 100 units of housing, which was the level of housing proposed in the application.

The proposed car parking for the site remained largely unchanged. Some minor amendments had been made to the underground car parking. The Planning Development Manager highlighted that the community facility building had been reduced to a single storey building to eliminate public and private use of a single lift.

It was outlined that the landscaping at the front of the site, facing onto Melton Hill, had been updated to soften the impact of the development on to the street scene. Minor changes had been made to building elevations and Block K was now proposed to be subdivided vertically rather than horizontally to make two houses rather than two flats. The scheme also now contained additional bin storage and bicycle storage than had been proposed previously.

The site's location was outlined. The Planning Development Manager explained that the site straddled the Melton and Woodbridge boundary, with the majority of the site being located within Woodbridge. The site was adjacent to the Woodbridge Conservation area and in close proximity to several Grade II listed buildings.

The two existing buildings at the front of the site were non-designated heritage assets. An application to list the buildings had been declined.

A map of the area was displayed, highlighting the site's proximity to the Woodbridge Conservation Area, the flood zone, the Ramsar site, and a Special Protection Area. The Planning Development Manager also demonstrated on the map the locations that had been visited during the Site Visit undertaken on 21 October 2019.

The Committee was shown information supplied by the applicant which outlined walking and cycling distances from the site to key service areas in Woodbridge, which the applicant considered demonstrated the good links the development would have with education, employment, travel, and leisure.

Photographs of the site in its existing condition were displayed. It was proposed to demolish the buildings currently occupying the site and to retain and enhance existing

boundary vegetation. The Planning Development Manager highlighted the conditions that could be brought back to the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee.

Additional photographs showing the views to the site from Woodbridge towards Melton and vice versa were displayed. It was intended that existing ingress to the site would be retained for both ingress and egress and that the existing egress from the site would be removed.

Photographs were also shown which highlighted the proximity of Grade II listed dwellings to the site and the site's relationship with dwellings in Deben Road and Kingsway, as well as views of the site from river towpath looking back towards the site.

The proposed plans demonstrated the variation in the height of the proposed buildings across the site and how they related to surrounding buildings. The Planning Development Manager outlined that the inclusion of sloping roofs further sought to offer variance in heights of buildings. The tallest building was proposed to be located in the centre of the site.

Two blocks were proposed to contain the affordable housing, of 32 units. Since the previous refusal of permission, the applicant had been able to secure a Registered Provider (RP) in respect of the affordable housing so that the policy compliant level could be provided on site.

The landscaping block plan was displayed. It was confirmed that open space would be located adjacent to the east of the site in the area identified as the flood zone. The pedestrian access from the site to Deben Road would be provided to allow public access through and across the site.

The proposed landscaping plan identified where vegetation would be retained and enhanced. Detailed landscaping proposals were reserved via planning condition. The Planning Development Manager considered that the inclusion of the pedestrian access through the site from Melton Hill would open up views towards Sutton Hoo and Woodbridge which currently did not exist.

The total increase in floorspace, in comparison to existing buildings on the site, was 47%. The footprint of the proposed development would be similar to that which existed on the site but would be dispersed across the site.

Proposed plans and elevations for the frontage buildings, affordable housing blocks, the site as viewed from both Deben Road and Old Maltings Court were displayed to the Committee. The Committee was also shown sections of the site as seen from both Melton Hill and Old Maltings Court and an artist's impression of the site looking from Melton Hill towards the rear of the site. Computer-generated images of how the site would look from various different locations were made available; the Planning Development Manager noted that these images did not show the proposed additional planting proposed for the site's frontage to Melton Hill.

The Committee was advised that the access to the car park via ramp would use existing land form. It was highlighted on the elevation of the site, as seen from Deben Road, where a balcony had been removed from the proposals and where a Yew tree

would be retained. The Planning Development Manager noted that some of the properties on Deben Road were either longer or shorter than the average and that boundary planting would be bolstered in that area.

A composite image was displayed, which demonstrated the difference in height between the existing buildings on the site and the buildings being proposed, as seen from Pytches Road looking towards the front of the site.

Photographs demonstrating both the view towards the site from Sutton Hoo and from the site towards Sutton Hoo, with computer-generated imagery included in the former to show the proposed development, were shown to the Committee. It was noted that the proposed buildings would sit below the existing tree line as per the majority of roof lines in Woodbridge, punctuated only by church spires, and that the development would be set to the right, and separated from, of town's historic core.

The Committee viewed plans that detailed bin storage and bin collection areas, refuse collection routes, surfacing, landscaping, vehicle access, visitor parking, emergency vehicle routes, resident vehicle access, and public and resident pedestrian and cycle routes across the site.

At this point during the presentation, the Chairman invited questions to the Planning officers.

It was confirmed that dwellings would have either balconies and/or outdoor spaces, depending on the type of dwelling, that could be used to dry clothes.

The Planning Development Manager continued her presentation. The Committee's attention was drawn to Section 5 of the report, which detailed planning policy considerations for the application. The Planning Development Manager noted that since the last application on the site the NPPF had been updated and that the site was identified for allocation in the emerging Suffolk Coastal Local Plan.

The Planning Development Manager spoke on the planning considerations detailed in the report. She advised that the scheme proposed was virtually identical to the previous two schemes determined by the former SCDC and highlighted that in both cases, the SCDC Planning Committee had not objected to the design, layout and visual appearance of the scheme. She added that the Council had endorsed the site's allocation in the emerging Local Plan and advised that the key considerations for the current application were the changes to planning policy and a detailed consideration of the impacts of the changes to the design of the scheme since the last application was determined.

The scheme was noted to be within the settlement boundaries and was considered a sustainable location for transport links that did not rely on a private vehicle. The Planning Development Manager stated that both the additional landscaping proposed, and the design of the buildings were of high quality.

The Highways Authority had not objected to the proposal subject to several proposed conditions; parking provision had been increased as suggested by SCDC and parking

would be managed by the site's concierge. It was intended that residents would be allocated parking spaces.

The Planning Development Manager said that the pedestrian access link with Deben Road would improve permeability across the site and would be of wider benefit to the whole community and not just residents of the site.

The key issue was said to be the design, layout and visual appearance of the scheme. The Planning development Manager advised that she considered that a bold design was not necessarily inappropriate and noted that the design was endorsed by the Council's Design and Conservation Officer, whose comments in full were appended to the report.

Officers were of the view that the impact on residential amenity was acceptable and highlighted that the site visit undertaken by Members on 21 October 2019 allowed them to appreciate the impact the development would have. The Planning Development Manager highlighted the retention of the yew tree and the removal of the balcony on the site's boundary with Deben Road.

The Council's Arboriculture and Landscape Manager was content with the application and would be responsible for monitoring the discharge of conditions relating to landscaping. Reference was made to the increased landscaping proposed on Melton Hill.

The economic benefits of the development were said to be additional Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) payments, New Homes Bonus payments, the creation of two full-time jobs, and the increased spend in the local economy that would be created.

The recommendations, as set out in the report, were outlined to the Committee.

The Chairman invited further questions to the Planning officers.

It was confirmed that details of refuse collection management would be a matter for the applicant and those managing the site. The Committee was advised that there would be a central bin marshalling area for refuse collection and that this would be managed by the site concierge.

The car parking spaces were stated to be wide enough for disabled access and spaces could be allocated as such.

The Chairman invited Mr Saggars, representing objectors to the application, to address the Committee.

Mr Saggars asked for the computer-generated birds-eye view image to be displayed. He noted that eight units of the affordable housing would be social housing and that the remaining 24 would be intermediate units which would be used for 'rent to buy' schemes. He considered that the application should fail on this test alone.

Mr Saggars also considered that the application failed due to the negative impact it would have on its surroundings; he said that the scheme did not relate well to the area

and would not enhance the Woodbridge Conservation Area. He referred to paragraph 127 of the NPPF and said that the scheme was not sympathetic to local character, history, or surroundings, despite the contrary view of Planning Officers. He added that, in his opinion, the Design and Conservation Officer's comments contrasted with the case officer and therefore should not be given significant weight when considering the proposed designs.

A more sympathetic design was considered to be possible on the site and Mr Saggars said that very few people seemed to think that the scheme would fit in to the local area. He highlighted the significant opposition from residents, Woodbridge Town Council, Melton Parish Council, Historic England, the Woodbridge Society, and the Suffolk Preservation Society. Mr Saggars asked the Committee to not make the community ashamed of the Council.

The Chairman invited questions to Mr Saggars.

Mr Saggars said he was not opposed to 100 units on the site if there was the correct proportion of affordable homes; he considered the 'Passivhaus' development in Norwich to be a more suitable form of development for the site than what was being proposed.

The Chairman invited Mr O'Nolan, Mayor of Woodbridge, to address the Committee.

Mr O'Nolan said that he was present to represent the views of Woodbridge Town Council and hoped to persuade the Committee to not approve the application. He focused on the affordable housing and compared to the existing need in the local community; Mr O'Nolan considered that the needs of Woodbridge had not been identified in the report and referred to the 2018/19 Gateway to Home Choice Report. He said that data within that report showed that the need for affordable housing in East Suffolk had decreased over the last three years and that the changes year on year reflected the variation of new affordable housing units available.

It was noted by Mr O'Nolan that social housing provided very affordable rent but that the proposed scheme included affordable units that would be shared ownership. He stated that other councils under Gateway to Home Choice allocated 80% of their housing stock to social housing and that East Suffolk did not provide this proportion of its stock on social housing. Mr O'Nolan said that the 40% of the requirement across the councils under Gateway to Home Choices could be satisfied by one-bedroom properties and highlighted that not one of the social housing units was a one-bedroom property.

Mr O'Nolan concluded by outlining the increased need for affordable housing and considered that the Committee had an opportunity to go down in history.

The Chairman invited questions to Mr O'Nolan.

Mr O'Nolan confirmed that his statement regarding housing needs being satisfied by one-bedroom properties was based on the 2018/19 Gateway to Home Choice report. He explained that his comment regarding the Committee having an

opportunity to go down in history related it being able to look carefully at the deficiencies in the application and refuse it.

During questions to Mr O'Nolan, there was significant disturbance from the public gallery. The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 3.58 pm due to this disturbance and sought advice from the Deputy Monitoring Officer.

The meeting was reconvened at 4.01 pm and the Chairman invited the Deputy Monitoring Officer to address all present in the Conference Room.

The Deputy Monitoring Officer referred to rules 20.1 of the Council Procedure Rules, contained within the Council's Constitution, which stated that "If a member of the public interrupts proceedings, the Chairman will warn the person concerned. If they continue to interrupt, the Chairman will order their removal from the meeting room and may adjourn the meeting for as long as they think necessary and may reconvene the meeting in another room.". He said it was the role of the Chairman to maintain order in the meeting and that this should be respected.

The Chairman invited further questions to Mr O'Nolan.

Mr O'Nolan confirmed that his chief concern with the application was the affordable housing element.

The Chairman invited Ms Barrington, representing Melton Parish Council, to address the Committee.

Ms Barrington advised that Melton Parish Council continued to object to the application. She noted that representatives of the parish council had spoken at length on the application in the past and that it had rejected the application on multiple occasions.

The Committee was asked to consider that the application to not comply with policy SP3 of the current Local Plan nor policies in the emerging Local Plan. Ms Barrington said that the parish council considered that the scheme did not meet the identified needs of the local community. She stated that when the application had been considered previously it had been stated that affordable housing should be delivered at the maximum possible on the site and was of the opinion that this was not the case.

Ms Barrington referred to the Council's declaration of a climate emergency and suggested that it should be looking afresh at this site in terms of reducing traffic in the area. She noted that the NPPF required net biodiversity needed to be above 10%.

Ms Barrington highlighted that, during the recent examination of the emerging Local Plan by the Planning Inspectorate, the Planning Inspector had queried the allocation of the site and that following discussion it had been agreed by the Inspector and the Council that the wording of the policy could be reconsidered. She said that the application should not be determined until the Planning Inspector issued a final response on the Local Plan.

The parking for scheme was considered to fall short of what was required, and Ms Barrington noted that the Highways Authority had commented as such and had requested that a travel plan be completed before the application was determined. Ms Barrington said that no such plan had been completed.

The applicant's consultation with the local community was described by Ms Barrington as being a masterclass in misdirection; she stated that the plans the community were consulted on were different to what had been proposed.

There being no questions to Ms Barrington the Chairman invited Mr Brown, agent for the applicant, to address the Committee. Mr Brown was accompanied by Mr Hughes, representing Active Urban Ltd (the applicant), who was present to answer any questions the Committee might have.

Mr Brown acknowledged the Planning Development Manager's comments that the scheme had been considered by SCDC on two separate occasions. He said that in both cases the SCDC Planning Committee found agreement with the design, layout and visual appearance of the scheme proposed. He was pleased to see that officers had recommended that the scheme be approved.

Mr Brown considered that the reason no scheme currently had approval related to the applicant's difficulty in securing a Registered Provider to deliver the affordable housing. He outlined that the first application, which had been approved by the SCDC Planning Committee, was withdrawn before planning permission was issued and that a second application was submitted as the applicant had been advised that Vacant Building Credit could be applied to reduce the number of affordable housing units, which was subsequently refused.

The current application had been submitted as the applicant had been able to make an agreement with a Registered Provider to deliver the affordable housing on the site. Mr Brown said that this would enable the applicant to move forward with the development. He highlighted that the applicant had engaged with 12 different Registered Providers over several months before being able to secure arrangements with one to deliver affordable housing on the site.

Mr Brown was of the opinion that the application met planning requirements and noted the additional arrangements in the recommended conditions, regarding the Construction Management Plan. The applicant was keen to make swift progress with the development should the application be approved. He concluded by noting how thorough and detailed the report was and hoped that the Committee could approve the application, as the previous refusal had been solely on the lack of affordable housing.

The Chairman invited questions to Mr Brown and Mr Hughes.

Mr Hughes sought to assure the Committee that affordable housing could be delivered on the site. He advised that terms had been agreed with a Registered Provider, the necessary legal documents had been drawn up and would likely be exchanged on 25 October 2019.

The Chairman invited Councillor Smith-Lyte, Ward Member for Melton, to address the Committee.

Councillor Smith-Lyte requested that the computer-generated image of the proposed site be displayed, as well as an image submitted by Mr O'Nolan which was an artist's impression of an alternative scheme that could be developed on the site. She acknowledged that the Committee was considering the application that was before it but wanted to demonstrate that a scheme could be placed on the site that would be more in keeping with the local area whilst still providing the same number of housing units, and would retain the existing frontage buildings.

Councillor Smith-Lyte referred to the NPPF, noting it gave greater weight to the environment and conserving and enhancing the area. She said that the site was brownfield and had a high environmental value. She also noted the air quality issues in the area and the NPPF's guidance that development should contribute towards compliance in this regard, querying how the application would meet requirements for air pollution in the existing area.

It was highlighted that the site was adjacent to a Ramsar site, the AONB, and was within the Heritage Coast. Councillor Smith-Lyte was concerned about the light pollution that would be caused by the height of the proposed buildings and the impact it would have on nature conservation in the area. She acknowledged that there would have been light pollution when the Council Offices were occupied but stated that this would have been during working hours only and not late into the evening.

The site could be viewed from Sutton Hoo and Councillor Smith-Lyte highlighted the concerns raised by both the National Trust and Historic England. She considered that the site would have a significant impact on the local environment.

In reference to the comments in the report relating to how much of the application site was within Melton and therefore subject to the Melton Neighbourhood Plan, Councillor Smith-Lyte said that a third of the site was within Melton and suggested that the Neighbourhood Plan therefore should be given more weight when determining the application. Councillor Smith-Lyte disagreed with the view that the non-designated heritage assets lacked architectural merit.

Councillor Smith-Lyte considered that the application did not conform to policies in either the existing or emerging Local Plans and said that, given the lack of comments in support of the application, it seemed wrong not to give weight to the genuine concerns raised by local residents. She proposed that a competition be held to secure an alternative development.

The Chairman invited questions to Councillor Smith-Lyte.

A member of the Committee queried why an alternative scheme for the site had been referenced. The Chairman noted that the image had been submitted by Mr O'Nolan and received by officers 24 hours before the meeting as required and had so been included for presentation.

The Chairman invited Councillor Mapey, Ward Member for Woodbridge, to address the Committee.

Councillor Mapey highlighted that 215 objections had been received in relation to the application and stated that his previous comments on it were on record and contained within the third-party comments outlined in the report. He explained that he was a newly elected councillor to a newly created council and respectfully suggested that the application had not been presented to East Suffolk Council previously, but to one of its predecessor councils, and therefore less weight should be given to the principle of the design, layout and visual appearance being accepted when previous applications had been considered by the SCDC Planning Committee.

Councillor Mapey made reference to the Local Plan's statement regarding the former Suffolk Coastal area of the district being an attractive place to live and work and noted that the Melton Neighbourhood Plan identified the site being vacated and the need for 70 new dwellings there, rather than 100. He said that aspects regarding design quality were a key principle for sustainable development.

The pre-application advice given to the applicant, recommending community engagement, was highlighted by Councillor Mapey. He noted that local residents had been quoted as saying that new housing needed to feel like it was part of Woodbridge and not a separate estate. He also raised concerns about the parking arrangements on the site.

Councillor Mapey referred to Building For Life 12 which stated that local concerns should not be ignored without robust justification and said that the application should be working within the existing site, including incorporating existing features. He considered that the application fell short in this regard. He was of the view that the proposed development did not compliment the local character, form or context of the surrounding area.

The highest point of the site was said to be 27 metres and Councillor Mapey compared this against St Mary's Church Tower which was 30 metres high. He said that the layout of the site should fit in to the local area and that the height and massing of the development should be well related.

Councillor Mapey referred to the Local Plan's position on the historic environment and heritage benefits. He stated that the non-designated heritage assets at the front of the site should be protected for current and future generations and were irreplaceable, and that the Council should be pursuing a positive strategy in this respect. He highlighted that the former Council Offices had acted as the Woodbridge Registry Office for many years and had hosted the weddings of lots of married couples in the town.

The Air Quality Management Area at the junction of Market Hill and Melton Hill was noted to be one of only three required in the district; Councillor Mapey was concerned that exhaust emissions from the increased traffic from the development would be funnelled into this area. He considered the air quality report commissioned by the applicant to be out of date.

Councillor Mapey said that the closest bus stops to the site were some distance away and estimated that at maximum occupancy the development would result in another 180 cars on the road, based on the current ratio of cars to people in Woodbridge.

There being no questions to Councillor Mapey, the Chairman invited the Committee to debate the application that was before it.

The debate was opened by a member of the Committee who was also Ward Member for Woodbridge. She acknowledged that she liked the design proposed and had done so since its inception, considering it a unique use of the site. She also considered the report to be thorough.

Following the site visit on 21 October 2019, which had concluded at Sutton Hoo to take in the view of the site from that location, the Member had taken the opportunity to remain at the site as a member of the National Trust and had sought views from visitors; she stated that no-one she had spoken to had thought that the development would detract from the view towards Woodbridge from Sutton Hoo.

The member of the Committee did have concerns about the impact of blocks G and H on Old Maltings Court relating to parking, noise, lighting, and air quality. She considered that the application had addressed the concerns regarding the site boundary with Deben Road. She stated that the Council, as owners of the site, had a duty of care to the community to deliver the maximum affordable housing and was of the view that the application did not achieve this.

Several members of the Committee spoke in favour of the application for its design, the pedestrian connectivity that the link with Deben Road would create, the mix of properties and the proportion of affordable housing proposed, and the issues that had been addressed on the boundary with Deben Road including the retention of a yew tree and the removal of a balcony that would have been overlooking houses in the area. One member of the Committee noted that the planning system did not protect the right to a private view.

The Chairman highlighted that conditions were contained in the recommendation to state that authority to approve was subject to several factors, including affordable housing and RAMS payments being received.

Several other members of the Committee expressed concern with the application noting that the affordable housing element was insufficient, the considerable level of objection from local residents, Woodbridge Town Council and Melton Parish Council and several non-statutory consultees, the arrangements for bin collections and the lack of recreational activity provision on the site.

A member of the Committee outlined the recent major changes to public transport in the area and considered that services were not as regular in the area as they once had been. He was also concerned about the additional litter that could be created by the development and the impact that this would have on the amenity of the area.

Another member of the Committee referred to Councillor Mapey's comments regarding the principle of the design, layout and visual appearance that had been

established through the determination of previous applications. He stated that it had been an evolutionary process to create East Suffolk Council to succeed its predecessor councils and that the current Local Plan, including its Core Strategy, had been established by Suffolk Coastal District Council. He also referred to the emerging Local Plan for the former Suffolk Coastal District area and the references to it in the report, highlighted by the Planning Development Manager in her presentation.

The Member considered that all aspects of the development had been covered by the report and noted that the site was allocated for housing in the emerging Local Plan. He considered that the development would not impact views from the AONB, that the design had been endorsed twice by Suffolk Coastal District Council, and that the development would not have an adverse impact on the adjacent conservation area.

Reference was made to the non-designated heritage assets at the front of the site; members of the Committee noted that applications to list the buildings had been unsuccessful. A member of the Committee said that it was important to note that planning decisions were not made by referendum but on planning merits in accordance with local and national policies. He also stated that architecture evolved over a period of time and that what was considered appropriate now may not have been approved in the past if the planning system had existed at that point.

A member of the Committee, who was acting as a Substitute, stated that she had approached the application with an open mind and had also sought the views of the Member she was acting as Substitute for. She said that she had considered the report in detail and had attended the site visit on 21 October 2019 and that her views on the application matched those of the Member she was substituting for. She appreciated the design and layout that the development would offer but felt that it was out of context for the area and was a good development in the wrong location. She stated that there was much to commend about the proposed scheme but was of the opinion that a development more in keeping with the surrounding area was required and would be voting to refuse the application.

The Chairman noted that she had voted to approve the first application and had voted to refuse the second application due to the lack of affordable housing. She said that the current application solved some of the issues with the site's relationship to dwellings on Deben Road and restored the affordable housing element to an acceptable level. She said that the applicant had assured the Committee that the affordable housing element of the development would be delivered and said that Members had to trust that the Council's officers would ensure this was guaranteed before consent was issued.

A member of the Committee stated that if the application was to be approved then a robust Construction Management Plan needed to be in place. She also sought assurance that any conditions subject to approval came before officers and Members. The Head of Planning and Coastal Management referred to page 78 of the report which detailed the recommended condition relating to a Construction Management Plan as well as the condition which required a scheme for the provision of affordable housing to be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority. He stated that the quantum of affordable housing met the requirements of

the Local Plan policies and hoped that this would provide the Member with confidence on delivery.

There being no further debate, the Chairman moved to the recommendation as set out in the report.

On the proposition of Councillor Cooper, seconded by Councillor Coulam it was by a majority vote

RESOLVED

That **AUTHORITY TO APPROVE** be granted subject to the receipt of RAMS payments and the following conditions:

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

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

2. The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until it has been completed in all respects strictly in accordance with the following plans,, for which permission is hereby granted or which are subsequently submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and in compliance with any conditions imposed by the Local Planning Authority. (Plans to be listed later)

Reason: To secure a properly planned development.

3. Samples and details of all external materials proposed, including facing bricks, roofing, eaves and guttering, openings and hard landscaping shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before development commences. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved samples.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory external appearance of the development.

4. No part of the development shall be commenced until details of the amended access (including the position of any gates to be erected and visibility splays provided) have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The approved access shall be laid out and constructed in its entirety prior to occupation. Thereafter the access shall be retained in its approved form.

Reason: To ensure that the access is designed and constructed to an appropriate specification and made available for use at an appropriate time in the interests of highway safety.

5. The areas to be provided for storage of Refuse/Recycling bins as shown on drawing number (to be added) shall be provided in its entirety before the development is brought into use and shall be retained thereafter for no other purpose.

Reason: To ensure that refuse recycling bins are not stored on the highway causing obstruction and dangers for other users.

6. Before the development is commenced, details of the service roads and footpaths, (including layout, levels, gradients, surfacing and means of surface water drainage), shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that roads/footways are constructed to an acceptable standard.

7. No dwelling shall be occupied until the access routes serving that dwelling have been constructed to at least Binder course level (or equivalent construction method) in accordance with the approved details except with the written agreement of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that satisfactory access is provided for the safety of residents and the public.

8. All HGV traffic movements to and from the site over the duration of the construction period shall be subject to a Deliveries Management Plan which shall be submitted to the planning authority for approval a minimum of 28 days before any deliveries of materials commence. No HGV movements shall be permitted to and from the site other than in accordance with the routes defined in the Plan. The site operator shall maintain a register of complaints and record of actions taken to deal with such complaints at the site office as specified in the Plan throughout the period of occupation of the site.

Reason: To reduce and / or remove as far as is reasonably possible the effects of HGV traffic in sensitive areas.

9. The areas to be provided for the [LOADING, UNLOADING,] manoeuvring and parking of vehicles including secure cycle storage as shown on the approved plans 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: To ensure the provision and long term maintenance of adequate on-site space for the parking and manoeuvring of vehicles, where on-street parking and manoeuvring would be detrimental to highway safety.

10. The development shall not begin until a scheme for the provision of affordable housing as part of the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The affordable housing shall be provided in accordance with the approved scheme and shall meet the definition of affordable housing in Annex 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework or any future guidance that replaces it and shall remain at an affordable price for future eligible households or for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing. The scheme shall include:

i) the numbers, type, tenure and location on the site of the affordable housing provision to be made, which shall consist of not less than 32 affordable dwellings. The details to include a mechanism for delivering an alternative method of providing affordable housing at the same level as approved in the event that no affordable

housing provider acquires some or all of the affordable housing within a reasonable timescale.

ii) the timing of the construction of the affordable housing and its phasing in relation to the occupancy of the market housing, with the delivery of the affordable housing prior to the sale of the 30th open market dwelling;

iii) the arrangements for the transfer of the affordable housing to an affordable housing provider or the management of the affordable housing;

iv) the arrangements to ensure that such provision is affordable for both first and subsequent occupiers of the affordable housing; and

v) the occupancy criteria to be used for determining the identity of occupiers of the affordable housing and the means by which such occupancy criteria shall be enforced.

Reason: In accordance with Policy DM2 of the Core Strategy to secure the appropriate provision of affordable housing on the site

11. The proposed link from the application site to Deben Road shown on Plan reference (to be added) shall be made available for use before any dwellings are occupied and retained in its approved scheme in perpetuity.

Reason: To improve and retain pedestrian permeability through the site and ensure appropriate linkages to established residential areas and key services and facilities in accordance with Policy SP1 of the Local Plan.

12. No external lighting shall be installed within the site unless details have first been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved lighting shall be maintained in its approved form in perpetuity.

Reason: To ensure any external lighting is designed in a manner having regard to visual amenity and residential amenity in accordance with Policy DM23 of the Local Plan.

13. Prior to the development hereby approved being occupied details shall be submitted to and approved relating to the provision of public art on the site. The details submitted shall include the design and location of the art, its maintenance programme and delivery timescales. The art shall be provided and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the proposal is compliant with Policy DM25 of the Local Plan

14. No development shall take place until the existing trees on site, agreed with the Local Planning Authority for inclusion in the scheme of landscaping, have been protected by the erection of temporary protective fences of a height, size and in positions which shall previously have been agreed, with the Local Planning Authority. The protective fences shall be retained throughout the duration of building and engineering works in the vicinity of the tree to be protected. Any trees dying or becoming severely damaged as a result of any failure to comply with these requirements shall be replaced with trees of appropriate size and species during the first planting season, or in accordance with such other arrangement as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, following the death of, or severe damage to the trees.

Reason: For the avoidance of damage to protected trees included within the landscaping scheme in the interests of visual amenity and the character and appearance of the area.

15. Prior to the development commencing a plan detailing the location of fire hydrants to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The hydrants detailed on the approved plan shall be provided before any of the dwellings hereby approved are occupied and retained as such in perpetuity.

Reason: To ensure appropriate fire hydrant provision is made and retained on the site.

16 No development (including any construction, demolition, site clearance or removal of underground tanks and relic structures) approved by this planning permission, shall take place until a (Phase 2 contaminated land assessment report) including,

- i) The results of a number of test bores/windows samples carried out at this site, indicating the presence of any contaminants; and
- ii) Where required a detailed remediation method statement RMS for the safe removal of any contaminated land and its replacement with inert fill or, alternatively, a plan of how contaminated land is to be safely encapsulated or otherwise remediated. This RMS shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the LPA. The RMS must include, but is not limited to:
 - details of all works to be undertaken including proposed methodologies, drawings and plans, materials, specifications and site management procedures;
 - an explanation, including justification, for the selection of the proposed remediation methodology(ies);
 - proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria; and - proposals for validating the remediation and, where appropriate, for future maintenance and monitoring.

All the approved remediation measures shall be implemented in their entirety prior to the commencement of the construction of structures, the laying of services or of any infrastructure on site.

The RMS must be prepared by a competent person and conform to current guidance and best practice, including CLR11.

Reason: To ensure that any contamination is appropriately managed

17. The Local Planning Authority shall be notified in writing at least seven days prior to any removal, encapsulation or other remediation of any contaminants.

Reason: To ensure that any contamination is appropriately managed

18. The Local Planning Authority shall require written validation (Phase 3 Contaminated Land Assessment) that -

- i) All contaminated material removed from the site is removed by an appropriate licensed contractor to a facility approved by the Environment Agency.
- ii) All imported material is suitable for its intended use
- iii) Remediation measures have been undertaken to render the site suitable for the use specified.

Reason: To ensure that any contamination is appropriately managed

19. Prior to the commencement of the development a Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. This Management Plan should include details of how the site is to be developed and include mitigation measures to prevent any loss of residential amenity to any existing residents. The approved Management Plan shall be implemented in its entirety.

Reason: In the interest of protecting residential amenity during construction and highway safety

20. The hours of operation for all constructional activities shall be limited to;
07:30 to 18:00 hours Monday to Friday
08:00 to 13:00 hours Saturday and
None on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity

21. No piling operations shall be undertaken unless the details and method of piling is previously agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity

22. Details of the location, height, design, any activity sensors and illuminance of all floodlighting used during construction works shall be agreed with the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development. Measures to limit obtrusive glare to nearby residential property and to minimise sky glow shall be incorporated in the design of all floodlighting.

Reason: To ensure that any external lighting is acceptable in the interest of residential amenity

23. Prior to the commencement of development details of the proposed public art to be provided within the site shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The proposals will be in situ before occupation of any dwellings hereby permitted and retained in perpetuity

Reason: In accordance with Policy DM25 of the Local Plan and promote public art within the site

24. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved the applicant shall submit to the Local Planning Authority for approval a scheme for the management of all open space and communal areas within the site. The management of these areas will be undertaken in accordance with the approved details in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity

25. No development shall commence until details of the strategy for the disposal of surface water on the site have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

- a. Run off rates shall not exceed (the below rates are brownfield rates with a 30% reduction, with the exception of the 1 in 1 + CC event);
- i. 1 in 1 + CC – 4.2 l/s;
 - ii. 1 in 30 + CC – 7.8 l/s; and
 - iii. 1 in 100 + CC – 12 l/s

Reason: To ensure that the principles of sustainable drainage are incorporated into this proposal, to ensure that the proposed development can be adequately drained. To ensure that betterment is provided to existing brownfield runoff rates.

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

Reason: To ensure clear arrangements are in place for ongoing operation and maintenance of the disposal of surface water drainage. The [X no of dwelling/building] hereby permitted shall not be occupied until details of all Sustainable Drainage System components and piped networks have been submitted, in an approved form, to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for inclusion on the Lead Local Flood Authority's Flood Risk Asset Register. 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 per s21 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 in order to enable the proper management of flood risk with the county of Suffolk <https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/flooding-and-drainage/flood-risk-assetregister/>

27. No development shall commence until details of a Construction Surface Water Management Plan (CSWMP) detailing how surface water and storm water will be managed on the site during construction (including demolition and site clearance operations) is submitted to and agreed 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:

- b. Method statements, scaled and dimensioned plans and drawings detailing surface water management proposals to include :-
- i. Temporary drainage systems
 - ii. Measures for managing pollution / water quality and protecting controlled waters and watercourses
 - iii. Measures for managing any on or offsite flood risk associated with construction

Reason: To ensure the development does not cause increased flood risk, or pollution of watercourses or groundwater

28. No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved, 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.

29. No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; car parking layouts; other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting etc); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage power, communications cables, pipelines etc indicating lines, manholes, supports etc); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant. Soft landscape works shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed number/densities where appropriate; implementation programme.

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

30. The approved tree/shrub planting scheme 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 5 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.

31. Prior to the commencement of development details of a traffic management plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details in relation to enhancements to existing bus stops to facilitate alternative means of transport, deliveries to the site and parking controls within the site. The scheme shall be put into place before first occupation of the dwellings hereby approved and retained in perpetuity.

Reason: To ensure that parking and traffic accessing the site is appropriately managed and controlled and alternative means of transport are enhanced in the interest of sustainability and residential amenity.

32. Prior to the commencement of development a scheme shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval, detailing the mitigation measures to be put in place in relation to impacts on protected landscapes arising from increased activity to these areas resulting from the approved residential scheme. The scheme shall be implemented before occupation of the first dwelling and retained in perpetuity.

Reason: To appropriately; manage the impact on nearby protected landscapes.

33. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, a scheme to show ecological enhancements in relation to birds and bats shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in accordance with the Ecological Survey produced by Skilled Ecology Consultance Limited dated September 2016. The scheme shall include provision for bat and bird boxes on the newly developed buildings or retained trees to increase the potential roosting and nesting sites for local bats and birds. The enhancements as proposed shall be put in place before first occupation of any of the approved dwellings and retained in perpetuity.

Reason: To improve the ecological potential of the site.

The meeting concluded at 5:00 pm

.....
Chairman