

WOODBIDGE TOWN COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** held in the Shire Hall, Market Hill, Woodbridge on **TUESDAY 21st JANUARY 2020 at 6pm**

Councillors:

Present: S Bale, Lady C Blois, S Miller E O’Nolan (Chair), R Sanders, A Semmens, M Sutton, C Walsh

Absent with Apologies: C Mapey and P Gillard

In Attendance: Deputy Town Clerk and no members of the public.

Action

700. **MEMBERS AND OFFICERS WERE INVITED TO MAKE ANY DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY OR LOCAL NON-PECUNIARY INTERESTS THAT THEY MAY HAVE IN RELATION TO ITEMS ON THE AGENDA AND WERE ALSO REMINDED TO MAKE ANY DECLARATIONS AT ANY STAGE DURING THE MEETING IF IT BECOMES APPARENT THAT THIS MAY BE REQUIRED WHEN A PARTICULAR ITEM OR ISSUE IS CONSIDERED, AND TO DEAL WITH DISPENSATIONS AS REQUESTED BY INDIVIDUAL COUNCILLORS IN LINE WITH S33 OF THE LOCALISM ACT 2011**

There were none.

701. **COUNCILLORS WITH A PECUNIARY INTEREST IN AN ITEM ON THIS AGENDA, WHO WISH TO REMAIN, SPEAK AND/OR VOTE DURING CONSIDERATION OF THAT ITEM, MAY APPLY FOR A DISPENSATION BY WRITING TO THE TOWN CLERK PRIOR TO THE MEETING. APPLICATIONS MAY ALSO BE CONSIDERED AT THE MEETING ITSELF SHOULD THE NATURE OF THE INTEREST BECOME APPARENT TO A COUNCILLOR AT THE TIME OF THE MEETING**

There were none.

702. **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

There were none.

703. **CONFIRMATION OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MINUTES**

It was **noted** that for item 657 the minutes should have given the following reason for the committee’s refusal of application DC/19/4714/FUL - Sandywood Broomheath;

We recommend REFUSAL due to the loss of seven healthy trees which are protected under tree preservation order ESCC/71/00100.

Further to this **it was resolved** to approve the minutes of 7 January 2020 as a true record, which were duly signed by the Chairman.

704. **TO DISCUSS WOODBRIDGE TOWN COUNCIL'S REQUEST TO CALL IN DC/19/4714/FUL**

It was resolved that the Deputy Town Clerk send the following communication to the East Suffolk Council Planning Committee.

Ref DC/19/4714/FUL - Sandywood Broomheath

The Planning Committee of Woodbridge Town Council strongly objects to the unnecessary felling of seven healthy trees as part of planning application DC/19/4714/FUL, which we understand that today (January 21st) has been delegated to officers without referral to your Planning Committee. We are dismayed that East Suffolk Council would support the destruction of these seven trees, all of which are protected by your own Tree Preservation Order ESCC/71/00100. This potential decision also directly contravenes your own declaration of a climate emergency.

Woodbridge Town Council is committed to its own declaration of a climate emergency so views the felling of these trees as a contravention of our 'Green Veining' policy, which aims to reopen wildlife corridors and enhance biodiversity in the town, for which Broomheath and its environs are an integral part. From our examination of the documents provided it would also appear there are a number of anomalies between the arboricultural report and architects report, notably a discrepancy in the number of trees shown in each.

705. **TO DISCUSS THE CONTRIBUTION TO THE JUDICIAL REVIEW APPEAL FOR CORONATION WOOD, REQUESTED BY CLIMATE EMERGENCY COMMITTEE**

It was resolved to accept the request from the Climate Emergency Committee to contribute £500 towards "Together Against Sizewell C"'s Crowdfunder campaign to launch a judicial review against East Suffolk Council's decision to approve the planning application submitted by EDF to: -

- a) chop down 100-year-old Coronation Wood,
- b) turn a large area of priority habitat acidic grassland, known as pillbox field, into a 576 space car park,
- c) relocate over 320,000 sq. feet of 7 largely non-essential and non-operational Sizewell B buildings and an additional 128 car parking spaces, that will encroach further into the AONB

This contribution will be funded from the Planning Committee budget (5150).

706. **TO CONSIDER APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION**

The Council agreed their comments as set out below:-

Application No and Address	Committee Comments
<p>DC/19/4659/FUL – Orchard House, 26 Moorfield Road</p>	<p>We recommend REFUSAL, reiterating our comments made to the original application, DC/19/0074/FUL;</p> <p><i>We share the concerns of local residents whereby if vehicular access to Upper Moorfield Road is made possible it could pose a danger to both schoolchildren going to and from Farlingaye School, and pedestrians in general.</i></p> <p><i>We also agree with the comments made by SCC Highways in their letter dated 11 January 2019, ‘if a new access is proposed at the location shown it would not be approved by Suffolk Highways as it is too close to an existing access’</i></p> <p><i>We also believe the application contravenes DM23a (Residential Amenity, Privacy and Overlooking), as the potential development will overshadow the property at 24 Moorfield Road.</i></p> <p><i>We suggest the SCDC Planning Committee undertake a site visit, preferably during school opening and closing times, to further understand our decision.</i></p> <p>We also believe the application contravenes DM7a, c and d (Infilling and Backland Development within Physical Limits Boundaries) and are also concerned that the boundary limits suggest that the footpath on the southern side of Upper Moorfield Road appears to be being given to the property.</p>
<p>DC/19/4815/LBC – Old Customs Cottage, 5A Quay Street</p>	<p>We recommend APPROVAL</p>
<p>DC/20/0050/FUL – Bull Ride, 70 New Street</p>	<p>We recommend REFUSAL. Woodbridge Town Council wishes to promote development and increased employment opportunities in the New Street area however feel this development is not suitable for such a location.</p> <p>New Street is a narrow, one-way road where collisions with the opposite Grade 1 listed public house have previously caused damage to its structure, whilst delivery vehicles and drays parking outside the pub make it difficult for vehicles to exit the access road to this property safely. There is limited on road parking for residents so pressure on the parking capacity caused by an increase in visitors to the area is only likely to exacerbate the problem – the business currently in situ is already causing problems.</p>

	<p>There is also a loss of residential parking within the development in an area where parking for residents is already at a premium.</p> <p>We agree with the comments from the Environmental Health Officer and are concerned about increased noise and odour from the commercial kitchen operations in an essentially residential area. The suggested odour and noise risk assessment must be undertaken, and the conditions stated met.</p> <p>We would also like to see a modification to the cooking processes as wood burning stoves emit fine particulates, nitrogen oxides, sulphur oxides, carbon monoxide, volatile organic compounds, dioxins, and furans. Breathing air containing wood smoke can cause a number of serious respiratory and cardiovascular health problems.</p> <p>Should the application be approved, we urge the developer to adhere to the comments made by the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service in regards to the installation of an automatic sprinkler system.</p>
DC/20/0028/FUL - 6 Ransom Road	We recommend APPROVAL although note there was no evidence of a planning notice at the site.
DC/20/0064/TCA - St Marys Primary Burkitt Road	We recommend APPROVAL
DC/20/0151/VOC - 19 & 21 Thoroughfare	We recommend APPROVAL

707. **CLOSURE**

The meeting was closed at 6.58pm and the date of the next meeting confirmed as Tuesday 4th February 2020 at 6pm.

Councillor O’Nolan
Chairman