

Unconfirmed



Minutes of a Meeting of the **Planning Committee South** held in the Deben Conference Room, East Suffolk House, Melton, on **Tuesday, 22 March 2022 at 2.00pm**

Members of the Committee present:

Councillor Stuart Bird, Councillor Chris Blundell, Councillor Tony Cooper, Councillor Mike Deacon, Councillor Colin Hedgley, Councillor Debbie McCallum, Councillor Mark Newton, Councillor Kay Yule

Other Members present:

Councillor Lydia Freeman, Councillor David Ritchie

Officers present:

Jamie Behling (Trainee Planner), Sarah Davis (Democratic Services Officer), Grant Heal (Planner), Matt Makin (Democratic Services Officer), Katherine Scott (Principal Planner), Rachel Smith (Senior Planner), Dominic Starkey (Assistant Enforcement Officer (Development Management)), Ben Woolnough (Planning Manager (Development Management))

1 Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Tom Daly.

Announcement

The Chairman announced that Michaele Coupe, one of the Council's Senior Planners, was retiring after a long career with both East Suffolk Council and its predecessor authority Suffolk Coastal District Council. The Chairman, on behalf of the Committee, wished Michaele all the best for her retirement.

2 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Stuart Bird declared a Local Non-Pecuniary Interest in item 7 of the agenda as a member of Felixstowe Town Council and Chairman of that authority's Planning & Environment Committee.

Councillor Chris Blundell declared a Local Non-Pecuniary Interest in item 6 of the agenda as a member of Martlesham Parish Council.

Councillor Mike Deacon declared a Local Non-Pecuniary Interest in item 7 of the agenda as a member of Felixstowe Town Council.

Councillor Mark Newton declared a Local Non-Pecuniary Interest in item 8 of the agenda as a member of Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council and a member of that authority's Planning Committee.

3 Declarations of Lobbying and Responses to Lobbying

Councillor Stuart Bird declared that he had been lobbied on item 7 of the agenda in his capacity as a member of Felixstowe Town Council; he said he had only responded to clarify the procedure of the planning application being considered by that authority.

4 Minutes

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

RESOLVED

That the Minutes of the Meeting held on 22 February 2022 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

5 East Suffolk Enforcement Action - Case Update

The Committee received report **ES/1092** of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management which was 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 18 February 2022. At that time there were 10 such cases.

The report was taken as read and the Chairman invited the Assistant Enforcement Officer to make any further updates. The Assistance Enforcement Officer provided further detail on enforcement notices that had been served on sites in Wrentham and Bungay.

The Chairman invited questions to the officers.

The Assistant Enforcement Officer advised that the Council had written to the landowner of the site at Sandy Lane, Martlesham regarding the use of caravans on the land and was waiting for further information on the industrial units placed on the site before progress the case further.

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

RESOLVED

That the outstanding enforcement matters up to 18 February 2022 be noted.

6 DC/21/4748/FUL - 12 Carol Avenue, Martlesham, IP12 4SR

The Committee received report **ES/1093** of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, which related to planning application DC/21/4748/FUL.

The application sought planning permission for single-storey front and rear extensions at 12 Carol Avenue, Martlesham. The application was presented to the Referral Panel on 22 February 2022 as the officer's minded to recommendation of approval was contrary to the objection of Martlesham Parish Council. The Referral Panel resolved to refer the application to the Committee for determination to allow for the impact of the change to the front of the terrace to be debated in public.

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

The Committee was shown an aerial photograph of the site which demonstrated the application site's relationship with the wider area. The site's location was outlined, and the proposed block plan was displayed.

The Principal Planner displayed a street view of the area and highlighted the character of the area and the location of the application site within that area.

The Committee was shown photographs demonstrating views of the front of the site, the rear of the site and the site within the terrace of houses on Carol Avenue.

The Committee was shown a comparison of the existing and proposed plans.

The material planning considerations and key issues were summarised as residential amenity, visual amenity and the permitted development fallback position. The Principal Planner provided details of the permitted development fallback position and explained this would have a more negative impact than what was proposed and there would be no planning control on the materials used.

The recommendation to approve the application was outlined.

The Chairman invited questions to the officers.

The Principal Planner confirmed there was an extension on the rear of a neighbouring property.

There being no public speaking on the application, the Chairman invited the Committee to debate the application that was before it.

Councillor Blundell said that the rear of the property was not significant and did not back on to another property; he highlighted that Martlesham Parish Council's main issue was the addition of the porch to the front of the dwelling and the impact this would have on the line of the terrace. Councillor Blundell considered that terraces up and down the country contained front porches and saw no material planning reasons to refuse the application.

There being no further debate the Chairman sought a proposer and seconder for the recommendation to approve the application, as set out in the report.

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

RESOLVED

That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the conditions set out below.

Conditions:

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

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

2. The development hereby permitted shall be completed in all respects strictly in accordance with Site Location Plan, Proposed Block Plan, Proposed Ground Floor Plan and Proposed Elevations (revised December 2021); received 27 January 2022, for which permission is hereby granted or which are subsequently submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and in compliance with any conditions imposed by the Local Planning Authority.

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

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

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

Informatives:

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

2. The applicant is advised that the granting of planning permission for the hereby approved development does not override any other legislation, private access rights or land ownership issues which may exist. The onus rests with the owner of the property to ensure they comply with all the necessary legislation (e.g. building regulations) and it is the applicants/developers responsibility to ensure that comply with all the necessary legislative requirements, and obtain all the necessary consents/permits.

7 DC/21/4052/FUL - Seaside House, 27 Bath Road, Felixstowe, IP11 7JN

The Committee received report **ES/1094** of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, which related to planning application DC/21/4052/FUL.

The application sought planning permission for the retention of works comprising the installation of cladding to the rear/side elevations and the erection of a free-standing balcony with stairs at Seaside House, 27 Bath Road, Felixstowe.

The referral process had been triggered in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation set out in the East Suffolk Council Constitution as the minded to decision of the case officer to approve the application was contrary to the recommendation of refusal made by Felixstowe Town Council. The application was presented to the Referral Panel on 22 February 2022, who referred it to the Committee for determination to give further consideration to the merits and impacts of the implemented works.

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

The site's location was outlined, and the Committee was shown aerial photographs of the site and the street scene. The Planner demonstrated the distances between the balcony and the rear elevations of bordering properties located on Quilter Road.

The Committee was shown photographs of the site displaying views of the front of the property, the rear of the property, the side elevation of the property and the rear elevation of the property. The Planner highlighted that the dormer windows installed on the rear elevation had been highlighted at the Referral Panel as needing planning consent; a separate application for this element of the development had been made by the application and it was not the subject of the application that was before the Committee.

The Committee was shown further photographs demonstrating views from the balcony towards the rear elevations of the properties at Quilter Road and from the balcony towards the south-west, north-west, south and north. The Planner detailed the presence of other balconies in the area on adjacent properties.

The Committee was shown photographs of the property comparing the site before and after development viewed from the rear of the property and from between properties along Quilter Road.

The Planner advised that the property was considered a positive unlisted building in the Felixstowe Conservation Area; the Council's Design & Conservation team had been consulted and concluded that the completed works had a minimal impact on the conservation area and caused negligible harm.

The recommendation to approve the application was outlined.

The Chairman invited questions to the officers.

The Planner confirmed that officers had accepted the aesthetic of the cladding, noting that although the colouring clashed with the adjoining property the materials were of a high quality and there was minimal impact.

In response to a question on precedent, the Planning Manager (Development Management) confirmed that precedence did not apply in the planning system and noted that highlighting the other balconies in the area showed that the development could be supported as being in keeping with the character of the area.

The Planner noted that there had been one third-party objection, set out in the report.

The Planner advised that the distance from the balcony to the rear elevations of the properties in Quilter Road was considered to be acceptable.

The Planner was unable to confirm if works to the chimney had been undertaken but confirmed they were not part of the application; he considered that the applicant would be best placed to answer that question.

The Committee was advised there was no evidence of the site benefiting from a rear-facing balcony in the past beyond the written statement in the planning application. Councillor Deacon, who was familiar with the area, noted that several of the Victorian/Georgian properties on Bath Road had benefited from front balconies for sleeping outdoors as this was believed at the time to have health benefits. Councillor Deacon said it was reasonable to assume that rear balconies had also been in place for this reason.

The Chairman invited Ms Dixon, the applicant's representative, to address the Committee. Ms Dixon was accompanied by Mrs Goodridge, the applicant's spouse.

Ms Dixon explained that Mr and Mrs Goodridge had bought the property as their first home four years ago and it had been in need of restoration. The couple had undertaken works to increase space indoors in addition to the work to the exterior of the property and had been recommended a builder by their architectural designer and Building Control had visited the site during the works.

Ms Dixon outlined that work had begun in 2018 and that massive structural damage had been caused to the property, which resulted in a legal case and the property becoming a building site whilst this was resolved. The legal case was resolved just as the country entered into the first lockdown which further delayed the resumption of the construction to September 2020, with the work being completed in the summer of 2021.

Ms Dixon said that Mr and Mrs Goodridge had felt it necessary to put a statement to the Committee and assured Members that it had not been their intention to deceive or flout planning laws, having been under the impression they had complied with the requirements to restore a run-down house into a home.

The Chairman invited questions to Ms Dixon and Mrs Goodridge.

Ms Dixon said that the cladding had not been installed for its thermal value but said that a positive by-product of its construction did provide insulation. and that the property had been insulated from the interior.

Ms Dixon confirmed that the cladding was concrete hardie planking.

Mrs Goodridge confirmed that they had not received any advice from Building Control, their designer or their builders that planning permission was needed for the works.

The Chairman invited the Committee to debate the application that was before it.

Several members of the Committee spoke in support of the application, noting that it had appeared to previously benefit from a rear balcony and considering that the development enhanced the conservation area through a modern design which blended in well. Councillor Deacon reiterated his earlier comments on the historical use of balconies in the area and noted that he had visited the site this morning to visualise the area. Councillor Deacon said that the cladding was not visible from Bath Road and only from between properties on Quilter Road and did not think the development impacted on the character of the area.

Councillor Bird noted that the cladding was visible from Quilter Road and said that the development had to be considered like any other occurring in a conservation area. Councillor Bird said that the cumulative effect needed to be considered and highlighted that the cladding was concrete hardie planking which was in stark contrast with the neighbouring property.

Councillor Bird considered that the nineteenth century character of the building had been lost as a result of the development and did not consider it met the requirements of policy SCLP11.5 of the Local Plan, which required development in a conservation area to either preserve or enhance what was already there. Councillor Bird said that he could not support the application.

Councillor Hedgley considered the retrospective nature of the application highlighted the shortcomings of the applicant in not seeking planning permission or even advice before beginning development. Councillor Hedgley sympathised with Councillor Bird's views but did not think it would be feasible to expect the applicant to undo the work.

Councillor Yule said she concurred with the points made by Councillor Bird but was in support of the application. Councillor Yule said that discussion was needed in future about how such situations arise and was concerned that other residents may feel a retrospective application was the best way to make changes in the future.

Councillor Bird said that having listened to the debate he would not stand against an overwhelming majority.

In response to a question on Building Control, the Planning Manager said it may have been an Approved Inspector used rather than the Council's Building Control service and said it was not the role of Building Control officers to comment on matters related to planning permission.

There being no further debate the Chairman sought a proposer and seconder for the recommendation to approve the application, as set out in the report.

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

RESOLVED

That the application be **APPROVED** and the existing works retained subject to the following conditions.

Conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be retained in accordance with the details received by application validated on 12 October 2021, including the following drawing(s) and document(s):

- Proposed block plan (received 11 October 2021);
- Site location plan (received 11 October 2021);
- 'Balcony viewed from back garden' (received 11 October 2021);
- 'Gable end wall viewed from back garden' (received 11 October 2021).

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

2. The materials and finishes shall be retained as indicated within the submitted application, unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

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

3. The hereby approved cladding shall be retained in the approved form to all elevational walls apart from the subject building's front elevation and the south facing side gable on the original main building, directedly adjoining the front elevation. No further cladding shall be installed.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt as to what has been approved and in the interest of protecting visual amenity and the special historic interest of the Conservation Area.

Informatives:

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

8 DC/21/5183/FUL - 10 Haughley Drive, Rushmere St Andrew, Ipswich, IP4 5QU

The Committee received report **ES/1095** of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, which related to planning application DC/21/5183/FUL.

The application sought planning permission to replace a boundary wall with a fence closer to the pavement with a one-metre gap for planting, enlarging the residential curtilage of the site.

As the officer's minded to recommendation was to approve the application, contrary to the recommendation of refusal from Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council, the application was presented to the Referral Panel on 15 February 2022 who referred the application to the Committee for determination.

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

The site's location was outlined; the property was on the corner of Haughley Drive and the current hedgerow and fence was positioned two to three metres from the pavement. The Committee was shown the proposed block plan which detailed the repositioning of the fence.

The Committee was shown photographs of the site demonstrating views west along the boundary from the road, an example of the proposed fence with hedgerow planted one metre in front and an example of the proposed planting. The Committee also received images of similar schemes in the area that had been approved. The Trainee Planner confirmed that the proposed planting, which would be secured by condition, had been approved by the Council's Principal Landscape and Arboricultural Officer.

The material planning considerations were summarised as design and visual amenity.

The recommendation to approve the application was outlined.

The Chairman invited questions to the officers.

The Trainee Planner advised that the scheme had been designed to minimise the spread from the hedge into the footpath and increase the amenity garden space of the host dwelling.

In response to a question on the proposed colour of the fence, the Trainee Planner was of the understanding that this was down to the applicant's preference.

Councillor Newton noted that the report was incorrect at paragraph 1.2 as it stated he had submitted objections to the application which he had not done, and referred to the Planning Committee North. The Trainee Planner acknowledged the errors in the report.

There being no public speaking on the application, the Chairman invited the Committee to debate the application that was before it.

Councillor Newton supported the objection of Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council, noting that Haughley Drive was part of an open area and the existing hedgerow spread to the footpath due to a lack of maintenance. Councillor Newton remained open minded but was leaning towards refusal of the application.

Councillor McCallum said that she was concerned about the increased fencing in the area and said it was sad that people felt the need to enclose themselves.

Councillors Hedgley and Bird both highlighted that the applicant was looking to move their fence to encompass their own land and noted that similar schemes had been approved in the immediate area. Councillor Bird said that there was a case for residents putting a hard boundary right up to their curtilage and pointed out that in this instance the applicant was leaving one metre for planting to screen the fence.

There being no further debate the Chairman sought a proposer and seconder for the recommendation to approve the application, as set out in the report.

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

RESOLVED

That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the conditions listed below.

Conditions:

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

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

2. The development hereby permitted shall be completed in all respects strictly in accordance with Block Plan, Fence Details received 16/12/2021 and site plan received 16/11/2021, 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 western site boundary (adjacent the hereby approved new fence) shall be planted as a *Griselinia littoralis* not later than the first planting season following the commencement of the development; and any plants which die during the first three years shall be replaced in the next planting season.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and the appearance of the locality.

4. Within 3 months of the fence being erected, the timber sections of the hereby approved fence shall be stained in a dark colour and be retained in that colour thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

Informatives:

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

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

9 DC/20/5252/VOC - Riduna Park, Station Road, Melton, Woodbridge, IP12 1QT

The Committee received report **ES/1096** of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, which related to planning application DC/20/5252/VOC.

The application sought to vary condition 13 of planning permission C09/0584 which permitted the development of two-storey business units within Melton. Development of the site had been completed and was known as Riduna Park. Condition 13 restricted the use of the units across the whole site to (previous use class classifications) of B1, B2 or A2 and one unit being permitted to be an A3 cafe use.

The application originally sought to remove this restriction on use to enable all units to be able to be used within the new 'Commercial', Class E Use Class. Following concerns raised regarding the potential impact on Woodbridge Town Centre and in accordance with policy, a revised proposal was made to include up to a maximum of six units (excluding the existing cafe (Unit 1), East Suffolk House and units 7-9 (those currently occupied by East Suffolk Council)) to have a more flexible Class E use.

As the application site included land owned by East Suffolk Council the application was before the Committee for determination, in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation set out in the East Suffolk Council Constitution.

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

The site's location was outlined, and the Committee was shown a map of the Riduna Park site detailing the location of the units excluded from the variation and the units the variation would apply to. The Senior Planner highlighted the spread of applicable units across the site, to allow for a degree of flexibility in locations.

The material planning considerations were summarised as the potential impact on Woodbridge town centre, residential amenity and parking.

The recommendation to approve the application was outlined.

The Chairman invited questions to the officers.

The Senior Planner advised that the response from the Highways Authority indicated that there would be no significant change in vehicle movements on Riduna Park as a result of the change of use class.

The Chairman invited Mr Aronson, agent for the applicant, to address the Committee.

Mr Aronson said that the amount of time taken for the application to reach this stage reflected the rigorous process from the applicant and officers to reach such a high standard and thanked officers for their constructive approach.

Mr Aronson explained that the application had been made ahead of the third national COVID-19 lockdown at a time when the demand for office space had slumped, as the applicant wanted to update the permitted uses on the site to comply with government policy on promoting the use of buildings for commercial purposes.

Mr Aronson advised that said that the variation of condition 13 would allow the applicant to deliver a business park with higher occupancy and would provide mixed commercial benefits. Mr Aronson said that the applicant acknowledged the possible impact on Woodbridge town centre and had sought professional advice on this matter. Mr Aronson said that the applicant remained of the view that Riduna Park's offer was different to that of Woodbridge town centre but acknowledged that without more commercial businesses occupying units on the site, this was difficult to prove.

Mr Aronson confirmed that the applicant was content with the compromise proposal made by officers as it would provide an improved commercial environment to keep Riduna Park sustainable without impacting on local amenity and Woodbridge town centre.

The Chairman invited questions to Mr Aronson.

Mr Aronson said the proposed change of use would not involve the intensification of use on the site and that the quantum of development would be unchanged.

Mr Aronson confirmed that the applicant had received a range of enquiries for vacant units on the site.

The Chairman invited the Committee to debate the application that was before it.

Several members of the Committee highlighted concerns about parking on Riduna Park, given the existing parking issues there, highlighting that parking spaces at the front of units should be used for parking and not for retail purposes such as was the case outside the existing cafe at unit 1.

The Planning Manager (Development Management) advised that the application before the Committee was to vary condition 13 of planning permission C09/0584 and that all other planning conditions from that extant consent would remain in place, including condition 10 which controlled the use of parking spaces. The Planning Manager explained that any occupier of a unit would need to apply for a separate variation of condition 10, as had been the case at unit 1.

In response to concerns raised during debate on the intensification of parking on the site, the Planning Manager highlighted that the change of use would impact on how the parking spaces would be used; rather than being used for the entirety of a working day by office workers there would be a more diverse and less intense use of parking spaces allocated to these units.

There being no further debate the Chairman sought a proposer and seconder for the recommendation to approve the application, as set out in the report.

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

RESOLVED

That the variation of condition 13 be **APPROVED** to read as follows:

"The premises herein referred to, shall be used for purposes within Use Class E(c) and E(g) and for no other purpose (including any other purpose in Class E of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning [Use Classes] Order 1987) (as amended) (or any Order revoking or re-enacting the said Order) with the exception of Unit 1 which shall be used for a purpose within Class E (b) and a maximum of six units (out of Units 2-6 and 10-27) at any one time which may be used for any purpose set out within Class E of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning [Use Classes] Order 1987) (as amended) (or any Order revoking or re-enacting the said Order)

Reason: In order that the local planning authority may retain control over this site in the interests of amenity, the protection of the local environment and to ensure there would be no adverse impact on the vitality and viability of Woodbridge Town Centre subject to controlling conditions as previously imposed on the original application (and as amended since in subsequent applications)."

Conditions:

2. The scheme for the provision and implementation of surface water drainage shall be constructed and completed in accordance with drawing no. 612668/108 Rev P4 before occupation of any part of the development herein approved.

Reason: To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of/disposal of surface water from the site.

3. Details in respect of the adoption and maintenance of any surface water drainage features shall accord with details approved on 7th June 2013 unless otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of/disposal of surface water from the site for the lifetime of the development.

4. The finished floor levels of the buildings herein approved shall be set between 2.84m AOD and 4.74m AOD as shown on drawing 1724/50H.

Reason: To ensure appropriate protection from flooding to the development and its occupants.

5. Flood proofing measures as detailed in paragraph 4.8 of Flood Risk Assessment SJC/612668/LSP shall be incorporated into the proposed development.

Reason: To minimise the damage to buildings in the event of flooding and enable a faster recovery once flood waters have subsided.

6. Details in respect of the Flood Evacuation Plan shall accord with details approved on 7th June 2013 unless otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure appropriate measures are in place to give adequate warning to occupants of any impending flood event and how to leave the site safely.

7. Surface water from impermeable vehicle parking areas and service areas, shall be passed through a storm by-pass oil interceptor. It must be designed to receive flows of up to 50mm/hour from the connected area, with all flows up to 5mm/hour rainfall, passing through the interceptor and receiving a minimum 6 minutes retention in each interception chamber.

Reason: To prevent pollution of the water environment.

8. Details in respect of the means to prevent surface water discharge shall accord with details approved on 7th June 2013 and thereafter retained, unless otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority.

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

9. Details in respect of the Travel Plan shall accord with details approved on 7th June 2013 and thereafter adhered to, unless otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of sustainable development.

10. The use shall not commence until the area(s) within the site shown on Drawing Number 1724-50H for the purpose of loading, unloading, manoeuvring and parking of vehicles has been provided. Thereafter the area(s) shall be retained and used for no other purpose.

Reason: To ensure that sufficient space for the on site parking of vehicles is provided and maintained in order to ensure the provision of adequate on-site space for the parking and manoeuvring of vehicles where on-street parking and manoeuvring would be detrimental to highway safety to users of the highway.

11. At least 5% of all car parking spaces shall be a minimum of 3.3m wide and shall be retained and made available to persons with disabilities.

Reason: To provide suitable parking spaces for those with disabilities to gain access to the buildings/employment.

12. Details in respect of the Full Site Investigation and Remediation Strategy shall accord with details approved on 7th June 2013, unless otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure adequate mitigation of the risks to human health identified in the MLM Environmental Phase 1 Desk Study Report (ref DMB/722106/R1 March 2009).

13. The premises herein referred to, shall be used for purposes within Use Class E(c) and E(g) and for no other purpose (including any other purpose in Class E of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning [Use Classes] Order 1987) (as amended) (or any Order revoking or re-enacting the said Order) with the exception of Unit 1 which shall be used for a purpose within Class E (b) and a maximum of six units (out of Units 2-6 and 10-27) at any one time which may be used for any purpose set out within Class E of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning [Use Classes] Order 1987) (as amended) (or any Order revoking or reenacting the said Order)

Reasons: In order that the local planning authority may retain control over this site in the interests of amenity, the protection of the local environment and to ensure there would be no adverse impact on the vitality and viability of Woodbridge Town Centre.

14. There shall be no activities, external storage or processes conducted outside any buildings.

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

15. Hours of working on the site shall be -
For East Suffolk House and Units 7-9: unrestricted hours.

For Unit 1 only:
Monday to Thursday 07.00-18.00 hours
Friday and Saturday 07.00-00.00 hours
Sundays 08.00-16.00 hours
Bank Holidays shall accord with the above opening hours.

For Units 2-3, 5-6, 10-16 and 18-27:
Monday to Friday - 07:00 until 19:00 hours
Saturdays - 08:00 until 16:00 hours
Sundays & Bank Holidays - none

For Unit 4 only:
Monday to Friday - 07:00 until 02:00 hours
Saturdays - 08:00 until 16:00 hours
Sundays and Bank Holidays - none
Unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

For unit 17 only:
Monday to Friday - 07:00 until 22:00 hours
Saturdays - 08:00 until 16:00 hours
Sundays and Bank Holidays - none

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

16. Hours of deliveries to, and collections from the site shall be -
Monday to Friday - 07:00 until 19:00 hours
Saturdays 08:00 - until 14:00 hours
Sundays & Bank Holidays - none

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

17. All extract ventilation installed in association with the Class A3 unit shall be vented via a filtered system, capable of preventing cooking odours, fumes, grease, dust, smoke and droplets from escaping the premises. Before the installation of such a system, the following details shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval:

- i) The proposed filtration plant;
- ii) Its ducted route through the building, and
- iii) Its final discharge point 1 metre above roof level;
- iv) Sound power levels of all fans, air-conditioning or other cooling equipment;

Only the approved scheme shall be implemented and shall be retained in the approved form thereafter.

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

18. Only the fixed plant approved by application DC/15/5085/DRC shall be installed and retained in its approved form thereafter. Prior to the installation of any further air conditioning, extract ventilation system, refrigeration equipment, and any other fixed plant, details of the equipment, its location, acoustic housing and any vibration isolation measures, together with the projected noise levels at the boundary of the property, shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and only approved plant shall be installed and retained in the approved form thereafter.

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

19. No refrigerated containers shall be stored on the site

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

20. Full details of any floodlighting shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval and shall be provided and retained in that approved form thereafter.

Reason: To prevent and/or minimise light overspill and sky glow.

21. Proper facilities shall be provided for the storage and disposal of waste material. Such facilities should totally enclose and adequately protect all commercial waste from insect and rodent infestation.

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

23. None of the existing trees or hedgerow on the northern and western site boundary(ies) shall be uprooted, felled, wilfully damaged or in any other way destroyed or removed without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority. Any trees or hedgerow removed, dying, being severely damaged or becoming seriously diseased within five years of the completion of the development shall be replaced during the first available planting season with trees and/or shrubs of a size and species which have previously been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the visual amenity provided by the trees and hedgerows.

24. The details approved in relation to protective fencing of trees and hedgerows shall be adhered to unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect the trees/hedgerow during the course of development in the interest of visual amenity.

25. Details in respect of the Tree Protection Fencing, shall accord with details approved on 7th June 2013, unless otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect the trees/hedgerow during the course of development in the interest of visual amenity.

26. Details in respect of landscape works shall be as approved by applications DC/16/1067/DRC.

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

27. Details in respect of hard landscape works shall be as approved by applications DC/16/4493/DRC and DC/17/2951/DRC.

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

28. The approved scheme of landscaping in respect of each phase of the development shall be implemented not later than the first planting season following implementation of the phase to which it relates (or within a specific time scale agreed in writing with the local planning authority). Any plant material covered by the approved scheme shall be retained and maintained and any removed, dying or becoming seriously damaged or diseased within five years of planting shall be replaced within the first available planting season.

Reason: To ensure implementation of the landscaping scheme at an appropriate time in the interest of visual amenity.

29. The proposed acoustic fencing to the northern boundary as shown on drawing 1724/50H shall be carried out in accordance with details received on 6 September 2019

Reason: To provide acoustic screening to residential units to the north of the site from traffic using the turning head.

30. The materials shall accord with details approved on 16th August 2017, unless otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority.

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

32. Arrangements for the storage and collection of refuse shall fully accord with a scheme which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, before the use is commenced.

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

33. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended the General Permitted Development Amendment (No2) Order 2008) or any Order revoking or re-enacting the said Order] no development of any kind specified in Part 8, Classes A, C and D of Schedule 2 of the said Order shall be carried out unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. (Part 8, Classes A, C and D refers to extension, hardsurfaces or the deposit of waste).

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.

Informatives:

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

The meeting concluded at 3.24pm

.....
Chairman