

**Unconfirmed**



Minutes of a Meeting of the **Planning Committee South** held in the Deben Conference Room, East Suffolk House, Melton on **Tuesday, 28 September 2021 at 2.00pm**

**Members of the Committee present:**

Councillor Stuart Bird, Councillor Chris Blundell, Councillor Tony Cooper, Councillor Mike Deacon, Councillor Debbie McCallum, Councillor Kay Yule

**Other Members present:**

Councillor John Fisher, Councillor Tony Fryatt

**Officers present:**

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

---

**Announcements**

The Chairman opened the meeting and advised that she had re-ordered the agenda; item 6 would now be heard after items 7, 8 and 9.

**1 Apologies for Absence and Substitutions**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Tom Daly, Colin Hedgley and Mark Newton. Councillor John Fisher attended as substitute for Councillor Daly and Councillor Tony Fryatt attended as substitute for Councillor Hedgley.

**2 Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Chris Blundell declared a Local Non-Pecuniary Interest in item 6 of the agenda as the Ward Member for the application site.

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

Councillor Stuart Bird declared that he had been lobbied on the planning application being determined under item 6 of the agenda; he advised that he had not responded to any correspondence.

Councillor Kay Yule declared that she had been lobbied on the planning application being determined under item 6 of the agenda; she advised that he had not responded to any correspondence.

**4a Minutes - June 2021**  
**RESOLVED**

That the Minutes of the Meeting held on 29 June 2021 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**4b Minutes - August 2021**  
**RESOLVED**

That the Minutes of the Meeting held on 24 August 2021 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

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

The Committee received report **ES/0898** 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 31 August 2021. In that period there had been nine such cases.

The Chairman invited the Assistant Enforcement Officer to address the Committee.

The Assistant Enforcement Officer advised that the enforcement cases at Top Street, Martlesham and Homeland House, Ashbocking Road, Swiland would be heard at court on 15 October 2021.

A site visit had been undertaken to Dairy Farm Cottage, Sutton Hoo, on 16 September 2021 where it was found that the summer house remained in situ. The Assistant Enforcement Officer confirmed that a letter requesting its removal had been served.

The Chairman invited questions to the officers.

The Assistant Enforcement Officer was unclear on which court would be hearing the two cases on 15 October 2021 and confirmed that he would identify this information and share it with the Committee after the meeting.

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

**RESOLVED**

That the outstanding enforcement matters up to 31 August 2021 be noted.

**7 DC/21/3601/FUL - 11 Knights Lane, Kesgrave, IP5 2FS**

The Committee received report **ES/0900** of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, which related to planning application DC/21/3601/FUL.

The application sought permission to erect a flat roof rear extension and to create a new porch space with WC at 11 Knights Lane, Kesgrave.

The application was presented to the Planning Referral Panel on 7 September 2021 due to the objection from Kesgrave Town Council being contrary to the officer recommendation of approval. The Planning Referral Panel referred the item to the Committee, to enable debate as to whether the loss of parking space warranted the refusal of the application and if the application proposed overdevelopment of the site.

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

The site's location was outlined, and the proposed block plan was displayed.

The Committee was shown photographs of the rear of the site, looking back to the rear of the garden and the front of the site including the wider streetscene.

The existing and proposed floor plans were displayed. The Trainee Planner noted that the conversion of the garage could be completed under permitted development regulations (pdrs).

The Committee was advised that whilst the addition of the porch would result in the site not meeting the provision of parking required by the Highways Authority's parking standards, officers did not consider that the application could be refused on these grounds. The Trainee Planner explained that as the garage could be converted under pdrs, it was considered unreasonable to refuse the application for the porch encroaching into the parking space at the front of the property. The Trainee Planner concluded that there would be sufficient parking for the size of the host dwelling.

The Committee was shown the existing and proposed elevations.

The material planning considerations and key issues were summarised as:

- The design;
- The impact on neighbouring amenity; and
- The loss of parking.

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

The Chairman invited questions to the officers.

The Trainee Planner confirmed that the objections of Kesgrave Town Council primarily related to parking.

The Chairman invited Councillor Rod Gibson, representing Kesgrave Town Council, to address the Committee.

Councillor Gibson advised that the Town Council's primary concerns related to the porch element of the application; he stated that development beyond the visible building line should be considered to breach the design concept of Kesgrave, which should be protected and preserved.

Councillor Gibson said that the Town Council therefore objected to the application, the same as it would for any other application that breached this concept. Councillor Gibson compared the application to another application in Kesgrave refused by the Committee, as it proposed fencing off an open plan front garden. Councillor Gibson said that no other houses in Knights Lane had breached the visible building line and that the approval of the application would set a precedent.

Councillor Gibson considered that the development would damage the streetscene and encourage further applications for development at the front of dwellings. Councillor Gibson said that the front extension would cause the loss of a parking space and would exacerbate an existing issue in the area regarding the cramming of parked cars on tightly designed roads.

Councillor Gibson concluded that the Town Council wanted to consider the future of the house for future generations and sought the Committee to be consistent with its earlier decision.

The Chairman invited questions to Councillor Gibson.

Councillor Gibson said he was not aware of other properties in Knights Lane having porches; he highlighted that there were no other porches in the streetscene photograph displayed by the Trainee Planner. The Trainee Planner was able to advise that other properties not in that photograph did have porches.

Councillor Gibson confirmed that the cul-de-sac in front of the host dwelling was used as a turning circle. In response to a query from a member of the Committee, the Trainee Planner confirmed that the host dwelling included a small space between the front of the property and its boundary.

Councillor Gibson was of the view that the space immediately in front of the property had been grass at one point.

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

Councillor Cooper noted that there was no comment from the Highways Authority in the report and suggested that all comments should be included, regardless of brevity.

In response to a query on the importance of the front porch, the Chairman reminded the Committee that it could not remove certain aspects of the development and had to either approve or refuse the application that was before it.

Councillor Blundell was concerned about the increased on-street parking that would be caused by the loss of parking on the site and was hesitant to refuse the application as a result, despite the statement at paragraph 6.10 that the site area did not meet the Highways Authority's space standards to be considered an off-street space. Councillor McCallum highlighted the contradiction at paragraph 6.12 which noted that the bed size of the host dwelling would not be increased by the development.

Councillor Bird considered Kesgrave Town Council's objection to be spurious as he was of the view that the open space standard applied to open plan gardens rather than something like a porch. Councillor Bird highlighted that some aspects of the application could be completed under pdrs, namely the conversion of the existing garage. Councillor Bird stated that it would

be unfair to retrospectively impose the parking space standard to the site when it had not been applied previously.

Several other members of the Committee spoke in support of the application, echoing the comments already made during the debate.

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 Cooper it was by a unanimous vote

## **RESOLVED**

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

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

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

2. The development hereby permitted shall be completed in all respects strictly in accordance with 547-01C received 28/07/2021, 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 materials and finishes shall be as indicated within the submitted application and thereafter retained as such, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

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

Informatives:

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

## **8 DC/21/2863/FUL - 38 Hall Farm Road, Melton, IP12 1PJ**

The Committee received report **ES/0901** of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, which related to planning application DC/21/2863/FUL.

The application sought permission to erect a single bungalow within the rear garden of 38 Hall Farm Road, connecting onto the previously approved three house development at Land To Rear Of No.36 Hall Farm Road And Accessed via Nightingales Close.

The application before the Committee for determination due to applicant being employed by East Suffolk Council indirectly through Norse. It was noted that the officer's recommendation of approval was contrary to Melton Parish Council's objection.

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

The site's location was outlined, and the approved plans were displayed to the Committee. The Committee was shown the proposed block plan and how the additional dwelling would link to the approved scheme. The Trainee Planner clarified that the applicant was different from the approved scheme so the development was not considered a further phase of the original development.

The proposed elevations and floor plans were displayed.

The Committee was shown photographs of the proposed entrance, the views to the north, the existing garden, the views west towards the site, and a drainage ditch at the rear of the site.

The Trainee Planner displayed a surface water flooding map of the area and highlighted the risk of surface water flooding on the application site. It was noted that major flooding on the site was considered to be a once in a 100 year event, primarily where the existing drainage ditch ran to the west.

The material planning considerations and key issues were summarised as:

- Design;
- The impact on neighbouring amenity;
- Flooding;
- Loss of trees; and
- Loss of garden/green space.

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

The Chairman invited questions to the officers.

The Planning Development Manager confirmed that had the applicant not been indirectly employed by the Council, the application would have been presented to the Planning Referral Panel as Melton Parish Council's objection was contrary to the officer's recommendation of approval.

The Trainee Planner confirmed that the approved scheme was subject to a three-year time limit to start development and that there was a proposed condition for this development to share the same construction management plan.

The Planning Development Manager confirmed that the Council's Arboricultural officers attempted to predict risk of tree loss due to development over time and considered each application in this regard; in this instance it was considered that the development's relationship to nearby trees was acceptable. The Trainee Planner added that the approved scheme had resulted in protected trees being identified as diseased and dying and it had been concluded that their removal was the best option.

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

Mr Price said he did not understand Melton Parish Council's objection to the application, on the grounds that it would be cramped development and detrimental to the area, when it had supported the approved scheme for three bungalows.

Mr Price considered that the proposed development would add another bungalow that would be similar in all aspects to what was already approved and that there would be more space around this dwelling, which would ensure a lack of amenity loss. Mr Price was of the view that the Parish Council's objections did not stand up to scrutiny.

Mr Price added that suggestions that a water pump in the area was on the verge of failing were untrue and that the existing pump in the area was only supporting 16 dwellings and could support up to 50. The pump had been struck by lightning but had since been repaired.

Mr Price outlined that drainage matters would be dealt with through building regulations and that no trees would be felled to enable this development. Mr Price considered the officer's report to be comprehensive and showed that the application was in accord with planning policies, and sought the Committee's approval.

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

Member of the Committee supported the application. Councillor Cooper stated he saw no reason to refuse the application and considered it was well laid out and blended well with what had already been approved.

Councillor McCallum said it was important to note Melton Parish Council's support of the approved scheme.

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 Yule it was by a unanimous vote

## **RESOLVED**

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

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 PL1001C and PL1002 received 15/06/2021, 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 materials and finishes shall be as indicated within the submitted application and thereafter retained as such, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

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

4. The use shall not commence until the area(s) within the site on dwg. no. 0484 PL 1001 Rev. C for the purposes of Loading, Unloading, manoeuvring and parking of vehicles has been provided and thereafter that area(s) shall be retained and used for no other purposes.

*Reason: To enable vehicles to enter and exit the public highway in forward gear in the interests of highway safety*

5. Prior to occupation, electric vehicle charging infrastructure shall be installed and made accessible from within the driveway. It shall then be retained and maintained unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

*Reason: To ensure the provision and long term maintenance of an electric vehicle charging station to promote sustainable transport methods.*

6. Prior to commencement an arboricultural method statement based on the draft version should be submitted to and approved by the local Planning Authority.

The development shall then be undertaken in full accordance with the approved arboricultural method statement.

*Reason: To ensure the continuity of amenity afforded by existing trees.*

7. 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.*

8. Any clearance works to the trees, shrubs, ditch banks or bramble should be carried out outside of the bird nesting season (March to August inclusive), to avoid infringing legislation which protects all nesting birds (WCA 1981). If this is not possible clearance works must be preceded by a nesting bird survey, if an active nest is identified, there will be a delay in this area (and an exclusion zone, as recommended by the project ecologist), until all young birds have left the nest.

To minimise risk of disturbance to potential foraging and commuting bats, during and post development, any external lighting should be minimised as follows:

- Any task lighting (during construction) or security lighting on the new building, should not be directed at boundary vegetation or mature trees.
- Any necessary security lighting should be set on short timers and be sensitive to large moving objects only.
- Other lighting around the site should be kept to the minimal feasible level and be directed downward and shielded to minimise light spillage.
- Hoods, cowls or directional lighting should be used to avoid light directed at the sky or towards boundary vegetation or ditches.
- Lighting times should be limited, to provide dark periods.
- Low pressure sodium security lights with glass glazing are recommended, as these produce the least amount of UV light. Avoid white and blue wavelengths of the light spectrum. The brightness of the lamps should be kept as low as feasibly possible (ILE/BCT, 2007; BCT interim guidance 2014).

Due to potential for hedgehogs (and other mammals) in the area, any foundations, holes or deep pits which are left overnight should have a secured plank, or other means of escape for mammals, made available.

In the event a non-native invasive species is identified during the works they should be removed from the site/disposed/destroyed of at an approved facility, to avoid spread of WCA Schedule 9 species.

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

9. The development will be adhered to throughout the construction of the development in accordance with the submitted Construction Management Plan approved by, the Local Planning Authority. This contains information on how noise, dust, and light will be controlled so as to not cause nuisance to occupiers of neighbouring properties and set out hours of construction/activity on site, the location of parking areas for construction vehicles and delivery hours for materials and equipment to the site before and during construction.

*Reason: To reduce the potential impacts of noise pollution and additional vehicular movements.*

10. No removal of hedgerows, trees or shrubs shall take place between 1st March and 31st August inclusive, unless a competent ecologist has undertaken a careful, detailed check of vegetation for active birds' nests immediately before the vegetation is cleared and provided written confirmation that no birds will be harmed and/or that there are appropriate measures in place to protect nesting bird interest on site. Any such written confirmation should be submitted to the local planning authority.

*Reason: To ensure that nesting birds are protected.*

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 proposed development may require the naming of new street(s) and numbering of properties/businesses within those streets and/or the numbering of new properties/businesses within an existing street. This is only required with the creation of a new dwelling or business premises. For details of the address charges please see our website <https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/street-naming-and-numbering> or email [llpg@eastsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:llpg@eastsuffolk.gov.uk).

3. East Suffolk Council is a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Authority.

The proposed development referred to in this planning permission may be chargeable development liable to pay Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) under Part 11 of the Planning Act 2008 and the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended).

If your development is for the erection of a new building, annex or extension or the change of use of a building over 100sqm in internal area or the creation of a new dwelling, holiday let of any size or convenience retail, your development may be liable to pay CIL and you must submit

a CIL Form 2 (Assumption of Liability) and CIL Form 1 (CIL Questions) form as soon as possible to [CIL@eastsoffolk.gov.uk](mailto:CIL@eastsoffolk.gov.uk).

A CIL commencement Notice (CIL Form 6) must be submitted at least 24 hours prior to the commencement date. The consequences of not submitting CIL Forms can result in the loss of payment by instalments, surcharges and other CIL enforcement action.

CIL forms can be downloaded direct from the planning portal: [https://www.planningportal.co.uk/info/200136/policy\\_and\\_legislation/70/community\\_infrastructure\\_levy/5](https://www.planningportal.co.uk/info/200136/policy_and_legislation/70/community_infrastructure_levy/5).

Guidance is viewable at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/community-infrastructure-levy>.

## **9 DC/21/3273/FUL - Sports Ground 2, Playford Road, Rushmere St Andrew, IP4 5QZ**

The Committee received report **ES/0902** of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, which related to planning application DC/21/3273/FUL.

The application sought consent for the erection of temporary cabins at Sports Ground 2, Playford Road, Rushmere St Andrew, IP4 5QZ. The application was before the Committee for determination as the applicant was an Elected Member of East Suffolk Council.

The Committee received a presentation from the Principal Planner, who was presenting the application on behalf of the case officer.

The site's location was outlined, and the Principal Planner noted that the application was retrospective.

The existing block plan was displayed and the Committee was shown photographs looking into the site, looking back to the site and the view from the entrance to the training ground. The Principal Planner highlighted that the photographs had been taken before the erection of the cabins.

The material planning considerations and key issues were summarised as:

- Temporary cabin - condition applied (five years)
- Dimensions
- Usage
- No car parking spaces lost or gained
- The application site sitting within land designated as 'Recreation and Open Space in Rushmere' (SCLP12.22)

The recommendation to approve the application, set out in the report, was outlined to the Committee.

The Chairman invited questions to the officers.

The Principal Planner confirmed that electronic records allowed officers to record when temporary consent is granted and detect when it has been exceeded.

The Planning Development Manager explained that the applicant had indicated that the temporary cabins were an interim solution pending long-term developments on the site when the opportunity presents itself. The Committee was advised that there was nothing stopping temporary consents being continually renewed but permanent consent for a temporary structure would not be issued.

There being no public speaking on the application, or any debate from the Committee, 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 Cooper it was by a unanimous vote

## **RESOLVED**

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

1. The development hereby permitted shall be maintained in all respects strictly in accordance with 'Anglian Water Sewerage Map' and 'Proposed plans and elevations', received 7th July, 2021, Site / Location Plan - '4051-01', Proposed Block / Layout Plan - '4051-02' and Proposed Floor & Elevations - '4051-03', received 15th July, 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.*

2. The materials and finishes shall remain 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.*

3. In five years, from the date of this permission; the building hereby permitted shall be removed and the land shall be reinstated to its former condition to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority at or before this date.

*Reason: To ensure the temporary building does not become a permanent fixture.*

*Following the determination of this application, the Chairman adjourned the meeting for a short break. The meeting was adjourned at 3pm and was reconvened at 3.06pm.*

## **6 DC/21/1575/ARM - Orwell Crossing Service Area, A14 Nacton East Bound, Nacton**

The Committee received report **ES/0899** of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, which related to planning application DC/21/1575/ARM.

The application sought approval for the Reserved Matters (including details of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale etc.) pursuant to condition no.1 of Outline Planning Permission DC/17/4257/OUT (Class B8 Storage and Distribution and Ancillary Class B1 Office

Uses including associated infrastructure, car and lorry parking) at Orwell Crossing Service Area, A14 East Bound, Nacton.

In addition, the application also sought to discharge planning conditions 4 (Travel Plan), 5 (External lighting), 7 (Phasing Management Plan), 8 (Surface Water Management Strategy) 9 (Construction Management Plan), 10 (Site Wide Masterplan Document), 11 (External facing and roofing materials), 12 (Roads and footways), 13 (Electric vehicle charging), 14 (Parameter plan), 16 (Boundary treatments details), 17 (Noise attenuation assessment) and 18 (Link road details) of DC/17/4257/OUT.

The Head of Planning and Coastal Management had referred the application to the Committee for determination, as set out in the Scheme of Delegation within the East Suffolk Council Constitution, due to the significant public interest it had generated.

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

The site's location was outlined; the Planner confirmed that the site was located south-east of Ipswich, abutting the Ipswich Borough Council administrative boundary, and bordering the Ransomes Europark Industrial Estate.

The Committee was shown an aerial view of the site which demonstrated its relationship to the surrounding area. The western half of the site was considered to be brownfield and the eastern half greenfield, and the site was accessed from the A14 via the existing Orwell Truck Stop access. A secondary access from the Ransomes Europark Industrial Estate also existed. The Planner highlighted that the Orwell Truck Stop was not located within the application site.

Photographs were displayed showing:

- The existing access to the site;
- Views within the site;
- Hardstanding areas within the site;
- Views from the northern boundary towards the west of the site; and
- The 'Shepard and Dog' and 'Routs' level crossings.

The Planner noted that the 'Routs' level crossing was not within the application site and access to the site via this route was not proposed.

The outline indicative masterplan and reserved matters masterplan were both displayed; the main access to the site would be from the A14.

The Committee was shown the parameters plan and the phasing plan, outlining the timeline of the development.

Drawings, elevations, landscaping and layout plans for all four proposed units were displayed. The Planner outlined the details of the electric vehicle (EV) charging points, pedestrian/cycling access, acoustic fencing, proposed materials, vehicular access (from the A14 and within the site) and the gated emergency access from Ransomes Europark Industrial Estate.

The Planner noted that the improvements to the A14 access would be secured via a Section 278 Agreement and that the site would include a four-arm roundabout with points of access to the north and west for future phases of development.

A computer-generated visualisation of the completed site was displayed.

The Planner outlined that each phase of development would be fully landscaped at the northern boundary of the site, creating a green buffer with both native and non-native species. An image of a section of the proposed landscape buffer was displayed.

The material planning considerations and key issues were summarised as:

- Impacts
  - Scale and amount of development;
  - Light, dust and noise impact on existing dwellings;
  - Height of proposed buildings on existing dwellings;
  - Visual impact on the Suffolk Coast and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB); and
  - Increased use of the 'Shepard and Dog' level crossing.
- Benefits
  - Fulfilment of Local Plan employment allocation in accordance with policy;
  - High quality design to BREEAM 'very good' standard (including PV, ASHP and EVC);
  - Pedestrian/cycle linkage to neighbouring employment area (Ramsomes);
  - Integration and enhancement of the existing Public Right of Way (PROW);
  - A14 vehicular access improvements;
  - The creation of 1,180 new long-term employment opportunities; and
  - The creation of 300 construction jobs over a two-year build program

The Chairman invited questions to the officers.

The Planner confirmed that the improvements to the A14 vehicular access would consist of an extension of the slip road used to access the A14 eastbound; vehicles wishing to travel westbound would need to travel to the Seven Hills junction of the A14 to double-back.

The Planning Development Manager highlighted that modelling at the outline stage had shown this arrangement would have no significant effect on the Seven Hills junction and advised that the Committee was now looking at the details of the access. The Planning Development Manager reminded the Committee that future significant improvements to the Seven Hills junction were being secured as part of the Brightwell Lakes development.

The Planner considered that the transport infrastructure proposed for the site would provide capacity for vehicular circulation. The Planning Development Manager added that the roads had been designed for Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) and assessed as suitable in that regard by the Highways Authority.

The Planning Development Manager confirmed that there would be pedestrian/cycle linkage with Ipswich via the link between the site and the Ransomes Europark Industrial Estate. The roads within the site had also been designed to include pedestrian/cycle access.

In response to a question regarding the Orwell Truck Stop, the Planning Development Manager stated that this site was subject to a separate, live application and was not part of the application site being considered by the Committee at this meeting. The Planning Development Manager said that the Orwell Truck Stop site would not be affected by this planning application and was not part of the outline consent granted by the former Suffolk Coastal District Council in 2018. The Planning Development Manager advised the Committee that the approval of this application would not prejudice the live application to redevelop the Orwell Truck Stop site.

The Planner recapped the proposed materials and noted the cladding and colouring proposed would enable the units to blend in with the landscape.

It was confirmed that the site would operate 24/7, similar to units on the Ransomes Europark Industrial Estate and would include facilities to accommodate staff and drivers using the site; the Planner said that the applicant's agent would be able to provide further detail of these facilities.

The Chairman invited Mr Adrian Day, who objected to the application, to address the Committee.

*The Chairman adjourned the meeting at this point (3.33pm) to allow the Planner to locate the slides that Mr Day had submitted in advance of the meeting, in accordance with the East Suffolk Council Constitution, to accompany his speech). The meeting was reconvened at 3.36pm.*

Mr Day said that he and other residents were devastated at the scale of the proposed development and the impact it would have on their quality of lives. Mr Day hoped that the Committee had studied the contents of the report in detail, visited the site and understood the nature and level of objections.

Mr Day considered that the site would cause noise and light pollution in a rural area that was usually dark and quiet at night; he was of the view that the operation of the site would create noise and light that would constitute unacceptable intrusion and be an impact on amenity.

Mr Day displayed an image of the Uniserve building recently constructed in Felixstowe; he stated that the height of the largest unit on the site was proposed to be the same as this building and said this gave an idea of the impact it would have on the surrounding area. Mr Day considered such a building to be inappropriate in the countryside and adjacent to an AONB.

Mr Day said that the largest unit would create a 21-metre high steel wall and obliterate views from the south of neighbouring properties, which he considered would be a loss of visual amenity. Mr Day also noted the proximity of the 'Routs' level crossing, which he said Network Rail had described as the most dangerous in the country, to the development.

Mr Day accepted that the site would be developed but objected to the unacceptable level of intrusion that would be caused by what was proposed, and was of the view that Members would object to it if it was on their doorstep. Mr Day suggested the applicant build out something to the scale that had been suggested in the outline application.

The Chairman invited questions to Mr Day.

Mr Day considered that if the height of the largest unit was reduced, the landscaping would mean residents would not end up looking at a steel wall.

Mr Day suggested that approximately 80% of residents had written in objection to the application and stated that some residents may not have been able to. The Chairman noted that there had been 19 third party objections and three neutral comments.

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

Mr Rainbird said that the applicant welcomed the recommendation to approve the application; he noted that the outline consent granted in 2018 had dealt with the principle of development of the site and that this application sought the approval of the details reserved by the conditions of that consent. Mr Rainbird said that the details were consistent with what had been included in the parameter plans, including the height of the buildings.

Mr Rainbird stated that there was a demand for high quality logistics facilities and that the site would provide three warehouses and associated facilities, which would blend into the skyline and landscape. Mr Rainbird considered that the site would promote alternative forms of travel through its pedestrian and cycle links, along with the re-routing of the PROW that existed across the site. Mr Rainbird also noted the improvements to the A14 access that the development would bring.

Mr Rainbird highlighted that there had been no objections from any statutory consultees and that the applicant had worked with officers when developing the scheme. Mr Rainbird cited that Environmental Health had advised that there would be no significant noise impact from the site's operation and noted the significant financial income that would be generated for the local area through economic activity and business rates. Mr Rainbird concluded by stating that the site would also support the continued growth and success of the Port of Felixstowe.

The Chairman invited questions to Mr Rainbird.

Mr Rainbird said that the proposed heights were an essential component of the scheme as this allowed for vertical storage, which allowed more goods to be stored in fewer buildings. At this point, the Planning Development Manager clarified that the Uniserve building, cited earlier by Mr Day, was 40 metres in height. Councillor Bird, who was familiar with the development, was of the impression that although the original application was for a 40 metre high building the final development had been built out at 24 metres high.

Mr Rainbird confirmed that each of the units would have self-contained car parking and servicing arrangements and that all drivers could be accommodated in the buildings. Between five and ten percent of the buildings would be office accommodation including showers and canteens.

Mr Rainbird noted that condition 5 of the outline consent required the applicant to submit details on lighting, which had been submitted alongside the application. The lighting strategy would incorporate Luxdrop lighting which would eliminate light spill.

Mr Rainbird advised that occupiers for the buildings had not yet been obtained and confirmed that the buildings would be warehouses rather than manufacturing; in response to a question on automation, Mr Rainbird said that the use of robotics gave rise to skilled jobs to maintain such equipment.

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

Councillor Blundell, who was the Ward Member for the application site, opened the debate and expressed unhappiness with the size of the proposed buildings, noting that this appeared to be a universal feeling in the area. Councillor Blundell expressed concern about the buildings dominating the area and wall-mounted floodlights causing light pollution during the site's 24/7 operation. Councillor Blundell was also concerned about the impact of traffic from the development, particularly the possible increase of congestion at the Seven Hills junction of the A14.

Councillor Blundell was undecided on the application; he was content with the employment benefits it would bring but was concerned about the impact of the development on local residents.

Councillor Deacon considered the development to be large in scale and very contentious; he proposed that the Committee undertake a site visit to fully understand the impact of the proposed development on the local area. This proposition was seconded by Councillor Cooper.

On being put to the vote, the votes for and against the proposition were equal. The Chairman therefore exercised her casting vote and it was

## **RESOLVED**

That the application be **DEFERRED** to allow the Committee to undertake a site visit to fully understand the impact of the proposed development on the local area.

The Chairman announced that the site visit would take place on the afternoon of Monday 4 October 2021, following the conclusion of the Strategic Planning Committee meeting taking place at 10.30am that day, in order to allow the application to be brought back to the Committee's next meeting being held on 26 October 2021.

The Planning Development Manager advised that officers would confirm the details of the site visit in due course.

The meeting concluded at 4.01pm

.....  
Chairman