



# WOODBIDGE TOWN COUNCIL

Shire Hall Market Hill Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 4LP

Locum Town Clerk: Gordon Mussett

Tel: 01394 383599

Email: [townclerk@woodbridge-suffolk.gov.uk](mailto:townclerk@woodbridge-suffolk.gov.uk)



## TO MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Cllr Bale

Cllr Lady Blois

Cllr Holdcroft

Cllr Mapey

Cllr Miller

Cllr O’Nolan

Cllr Sanders

Cllr Semmens

Cllr Sutton

Cllr Walsh

You are hereby summoned to attend the **MEETING** of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** to be held **virtually** on: **TUESDAY 16<sup>TH</sup> JUNE 2020 at 6PM**

Gordon Mussett  
Locum Town Clerk  
9<sup>th</sup> June 2020

To join this meeting as a member of the public please contact the Town Clerk via email – [townclerk@woodbridge-suffolk.gov.uk](mailto:townclerk@woodbridge-suffolk.gov.uk) for more information.

### ***Public Attendance***

*Members of the public and press are welcome to join the Zoom meeting. Members of the public will be invited to give their views/questions the Town Council on issues on the agenda, or raise issues for consideration or inclusion at future meetings. This item will be limited to 30 minutes duration but may be extended at the discretion of the Mayor.*

## AGENDA

### 1. **APOLOGIES**

To receive apologies for absence.

### 2. **DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

Members and officers are 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 are 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.

*Please be aware that the recording of this meeting is probable*

**3. REQUESTS FOR DISPENSATION**

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 in 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.

**4. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

15 minutes maximum.

**5. CONFIRMATION OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MINUTES**

To confirm the minutes of the Planning Committee held on Tuesday 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2020 – Copies in the Members' area and the public area of the website.

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

As set out on the attached schedule.

**7. TO AGREE THE DRAFT COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT MAIN MODIFICATIONS TO THE DRAFT LOCAL PLAN TO ADDRESS ISSUES RAISED BY THE PLANNING INSPECTOR - ATTACHED**

**8. CLOSURE**

---

## WOODBRIIDGE TOWN COUNCIL

Minutes of an on-line meeting of the PLANNING COMMITTEE held on TUESDAY 2<sup>ND</sup> JUNE 2020 at 6pm

### Councillors:

Present: S Bale, Lady C Blois, S Miller, E O’Nolan (items 1-6 (part) only), R Sanders, A Semmens, M Sutton and C Walsh

Apologies: G Holdcroft

Absent without Apologies: C Mapey

In Attendance: Locum Town Clerk and one member of the public

*Action*

### 63. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor Holdcroft.

### 64. 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

No Members declared an interest in matters on the agenda.

### 65. 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 no requests for dispensations.

**66. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

A member of the public spoke in opposition to planning application DC/20/1526/FUL indicating that the access was onto a very dangerous bend on a narrow road and involved demolishing part of a listed wall. In addition, the arboricultural survey had failed to properly identify the impact the construction would have on the mature trees in adjacent gardens.

**67. CONFIRMATION OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MINUTES**

The Committee approved the signing of the minutes of the meeting held 19<sup>th</sup> May 2020 as a true record.

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

The Council agreed their comments as set out below: -

Application No and Address	Committee Comments
DC/20/1706/FUL – Old Customs Cottage, 5A Quay Street	We recommend APPROVAL
DC/20/1707/LBC – Old Customs Cottage, 5A Quay Street	We recommend APPROVAL subject to any changes required by the District Council's Conservation Officer
DC/20/1526/FUL – 10 Market Hill	We recommend REFUSAL. The access to this site is poorly situated on a bend on a narrow road and involves demolition of part of a listed wall. The choice of materials is not in keeping with the street scene. Both of these issues are contrary to Policy SCLP7 and SCLP11.1. The Arboricultural Survey fails to identify the ancient and long-established mature trees whose roots will inevitably be affected by the development and for which there are no mitigation measures in the application. The steeply graded access will not only create issues in accessing the site but also lead to additional surface water run-off for which there are no measures for alleviation contained in the application.
DC/20/1780/FUL – 37A Grundisburgh Road	We recommend REFUSAL as this is contrary to planning condition 4 of the approval DC/15/1656. That condition was the requirement which enabled the creation of separate living accommodation above the

	garage and was intended to prevent the very thing now being applied for. In addition, the creation of a new access will add additional pressures on the existing road layout.
DC/20/1784/FUL – Queens House, Land west of Bredfield Street	We recommend APPROVAL

*Councillor O’Nolan left the meeting.*

DC/20/1636/OUT - Land West Of Prow 21 Woods Lane Melton	We recommend REFUSAL in view of the lack of clarity regarding potential ground contamination, insufficient information regarding dealing with potential surface water run-off and the impact on traffic on the adjacent road network by the creation of a new access.
--	---

**69. TO AGREE THE DRAFT COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT MAIN MODIFICATIONS TO THE DRAFT LOCAL PLAN TO ADDRESS ISSUES RAISED BY THE PLANNING INSPECTOR**

The Chairman reported that the comments on the draft Main Modifications to the draft Local Plan to address issues raised by the Planning Inspector were still being finalised but would be presented to the next meeting of the Committee.

**70. CLOSURE**

The meeting was closed at 6.47pm.

Councillor Miller  
Chairman

## ITEM 6

TO CONSIDER APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION: -

### Links to East Suffolk Council planning portal

#### **DC/20/1930/FUL - 64 Seckford Street**

Proposed alterations and extension.

<https://publicaccess.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=QAZQOBQXJT900>

#### **DC/20/1975/TCA - 57 Ipswich Road**

T1 - Lime - crown lift to approx. 4-4.5m, reduce the height and spread of the crown by 3-3.5m and balance. Crown thin by approx. 10% and remove large deadwood over 20mm in diameter.

<https://publicaccess.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=QB8J8ZQXJWH00&prevPage=inTray>

#### **DC/20/1929/FUL - 42 Chapel Street**

Demolition of existing bungalow and outbuilding, and replacement with new detached bungalow.

<https://publicaccess.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=QAZQO0QXJT700&prevPage=inTray>

#### **DC/20/1894/FUL - Doctors Surgery 7 Little St Johns Street**

Proposed Extension To Provide Isolated Consulting Room.

<https://publicaccess.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=QAQK3RQXJQ600&prevPage=inTray>

#### **DC/20/1900/FUL - 48 Tennyson Close**

Single storey rear extension with flat roof and 'lantern' style roof-light to detached dwelling.

<https://publicaccess.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=QAVSXCQXJRE00&prevPage=inTray>

#### **DC/20/1958/FUL - The Corner House 1A Hasketon Road**

First floor side extension for private use.

<https://publicaccess.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=QB35DYQX07400&prevPage=inTray>

#### **DC/20/1819/FUL - 10 Market Hill**

Conversion to residential use of existing outbuilding to rear of 10-12 Market Hill.

<https://publicaccess.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=QAJAYVQXJM800&prevPage=inTray>

**DC/20/2036/LBC - 10 Market Hill**

Listed Building Consent - Construction of New Detached 4 Bedroom Dwelling and Associated Parking  
- Land off Chapel Street, Woodbridge.

<https://publicaccess.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=QBE39TQXJZR00&prevPage=inTray>

**DC/20/1957/ADN - Queens Drive Land West Of Bredfield Street**

Non Illuminated Advertisement Consent - 4 no. flags and 4 no. signs.

<https://publicaccess.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=QB34SLQXJUV00&prevPage=inTray>

## ITEM 7

### TO CONSIDER AND COMMENT IF APPROPRIATE ON THE DRAFT MAIN MODIFICATIONS TO THE DRAFT LOCAL PLAN TO ADDRESS ISSUES RAISED BY THE PLANNING INSPECTOR

The document can be viewed in full at:

<https://suffolkcoastallocalplan.inconsult.uk/consult.ti/mainmodifications2020/>

The Committee previously agreed that Councillors Miller, Holdcroft and Sanders would draft a reply for consideration at a future meeting of this Committee. This draft response is as follows:-

#### Overview

Woodbridge Town Council have reviewed the document entitled 'Suffolk Coastal Local Plan – Tracked Changed Plan Including Main Modifications and Additional Modifications -May 2020' which was presented for consultation on 1<sup>st</sup> May 2020.

Woodbridge Town Council have identified certain modifications within that document that it wishes to comment upon these being:

- Policy SCLP3.3 Settlement Boundaries
- Major Energy Infrastructure – various paragraphs
- Policy SCLP 3.4 Proposals for Major Infrastructure Projects
- Policy SCLP 3.5 Infrastructure Provision
- Policy SCLP 4.2 New Employment Development
- Policy SCLP 4.3 Expansion and Intensification of Employment Sites
- Policy SCLP 7.1 Sustainable transport
- 7.2 Parking Proposals and Standards
- Policy SCLP 7.2 Parking Proposals and Standards
- Policy SCLP 8.2 Open Space
- Policy SCLP 11.1 Design Quality
- Policy SCLP 11.5 Conservation Area
- Deletion of Policy SCLP 11.9 Areas to be protected from Development
- Policy SCLP 12.33 Land at Woodbridge Town Football Club

Detailed comments and recommendations are presented in the following sections. In the detailed commentary reference is made both deleted text from the Final Draft Local Plan as published in January 2019 and to new text in the 'Suffolk Coastal Local Plan – Tracked Changed Plan Including Main Modifications and Additional Modifications -May 2020'. For brevity the latter will be referred to as the 'new consultation document' hereinafter. Direct quotes from the former are in green text and from the latter in red. Where text remains from the January 2019 draft plan and direct quotes incorporated

below they are in purple text. Where Woodbridge Town Council proposes new text that text will be in brown.

Woodbridge Town Council would in particular draw attention to our views on the deletion of SCLP Areas to be protected from Development as it is our view the consultation process is compromised by this very late deletion of a key policy.

### Detailed Commentary

#### Policy SCLP3.3 Settlement Boundaries

In the Final Draft Local Plan (January 2019) any development outside settlement boundaries as defined on the maps accompanying that document was to be '*strictly controlled*' see paragraph 4. in accordance with NPP guidance and the strategy for the countryside. Woodbridge Town Council understood this to mean that there would be a strict limitation to such development to prevent coalescence of settlements occurring.

In the new consultation document the above wording has been replaced by '*carefully managed*'.

Woodbridge Town Council is concerned these amended words has moved the emphasis of the policy from one of strict limitation to a more *laisse faire*, permissive approach which would potentially allow the coalescence of settlements. **Woodbridge Town Council thus objects to the revised wording.**

#### Major Energy Infrastructure Various Paragraphs

##### Paragraphs 3.57

The wording in the Final Draft Local Plan (January 2019) required such infrastructure development which are likely to impact on existing and future generations to definitively led to economic, environmental and community benefits. In paragraph 3.57 it refers to such benefits '*will need to be delivered*'. This wording has been replaced in the new consultation document by '*may be required*'.

Woodbridge Town Council considers this is a substantive, and unacceptable, downgrading of the previous commitment to ensure an overall economic, environmental and community benefit from such developments. Developers putting forward proposals linked to, or part of, a major energy infrastructure project will be able to argue for no local economic, environmental and community benefits on the basis their scheme does not impact the community or environment sufficiently in isolation from other schemes or they cannot afford such benefits for their particular development.

#### Paragraph 3.55

In the new consultation document the wording in lines 9 -12 *'Impacts on the historic environment should be avoided, and if not possible, minimised. Opportunities to co-locate infrastructure may reduce impacts, and there may be opportunities to enhance the setting of assets through restoration after construction, operation and decommissioning'* lacks a positive definition of an obligation on applicants.

Woodbridge Town Council consider that the following change is required to bolster commitments to minimise impacts

*'Impacts on the historic environment should be avoided, and if not possible, minimised. Where opportunities exist to co-locate infrastructure ~~may~~ they will be encouraged to reduce impacts, and where there ~~may be~~ opportunities exist to enhance the setting of assets through restoration after construction, operation and decommissioning they shall be adopted.'*

#### Paragraph 3.59

This paragraph remains unchanged but Woodbridge Town Council believes the commitment therein to *'ensure the most successful outcome are achieved'* is substantively compromised by the alteration to paragraph 3.57.

In light of the above Woodbridge Town Council strongly objects to the revised wording in paragraph 3.57 and recommends the adoption of proposed wording to paragraph 3.55.

#### Policy SCLP 3.4 Proposals for Major Infrastructure Projects

The new consultation document amendment in the third paragraph at line 2 is now grammatically flawed as the word *'will'* is inappropriate due to the added words *'have regard to'*. As the subject matter is a third party's proposals it should be substituted by *'must'* or *'shall'*.

The wording under b) in the January 2019 Final Draft Local Plan was for packages of local community benefit *'to offset and compensate'* for *'the burden and disturbance experienced by the local community'*.

The new consultation document has amended this to *'mitigate the impacts of ....disturbance'* which removes a requirement for the developer to compensate for the burden imposed on the local community. This is a substantive downgrade by East Suffolk Council of support to its local communities impacted by such energy developments.

Woodbridge Town Council is of the view this approach is too developer focussed and is a failure by the East Suffolk Council to support its electorate. **Woodbridge Town Council objects to this modification of the Local Plan.**

In the same paragraph under i) the new consultation document substantially alters the implicit obligation and grammatic sense of the wording, the latter in a similar manner to line 2. The obligation on the developer, in the Final Draft Local Plan of January 2019, to deliver positive outcomes for the local community and surrounding environment is removed by deletion of the word *'are'*. The substitution of the word by *'will seek'* is grammatically inappropriate. It places no implicit obligation but assumes an undertaking over which East Suffolk Council has no control. **Woodbridge Town Council objects to this modification of the Local Plan.**

#### **Policy SCLP 3.5 Infrastructure Provision**

In paragraph 2 line 2 the new consultation document reduces the obligation of developers to contribute to infrastructure to an *'as necessary'* status. This is in direct conflict with the preceding paragraph 3.64 which remain unaltered and states *'All new development has a responsibility to contribute towards the cost of new infrastructure'*

#### **Policy SCLP 4.2 New Employment Development and 4.3 Expansion and Intensification of Employment Sites**

##### **Policy SCLP 4.2**

The changes are a double edged sword - the negative is that previously proposals would only *'be supported'* if there was no *'adverse impact on surrounding land use'*. The modification changes that to no *'unacceptable adverse impact'* (my underlining). The positive is that the impact now needs to reviewed with respect to *'living conditions of local residents'*.

##### **Policy SCLP 4.3**

This change downgrades the protection to environment sustainability, and living conditions of local residents from *'no harm'* to *'no unacceptable advise impact'* although on the positive side the wording maintains the original wording that permission will not be given if *'adverse impacts cannot be successfully mitigated'*.

#### **Policy SCLP 7.1 Sustainable transport**

The requirement in paragraph 2 f) for developers to *'improve public transport in rural areas of the District'* has been removed which Woodbridge Town Council believe is a retrograde step where local town centre hubs of employment are likely to continue to have inadequate provision of housing for lower paid workers.

Woodbridge Town Council has noted that the new consultation document has added a requirement for development incorporating the following two paragraphs *'Development will be expected to contribute to delivery of local sustainable transport strategies for managing cumulative impacts of growth'* and that *'opportunities to improve provision or access will be supported'*.

Woodbridge Town Council consider that the wording of the first paragraph is ambiguous. It could be readily interpreted, particularly when read with the second new paragraph, to mean only a contribution to delivery of a strategy within a document. **Woodbridge Town Council strongly recommends the removal of the word *'strategies'* so that it is abundantly clear it is delivery of sustainable transport.**

The second new paragraph provides no requirement for provision or access to sustainable transport but relies on the good will of a developer. The wording thus has no teeth and is too developer focussed. **Woodbridge Town Council recommends the removal of the second new paragraph or the replacement of *'supported'* by *'expected'*.**

## **7.2 Parking Proposals and Standards**

The additional wording in the new consultation document's revised paragraph 7.18 downgrades the importance of standards in SCC document 'Suffolk Guidance for Parking'. They are now stated to be *'the principle starting point'* rather than standards required as is readily implicit in the first part of the paragraph. The author's regular use of the word 'standards' also implies that they are not guidance on which a view may be taken. Whilst the additional wording does require evidence to be produced as to why a standard *'is not applicable'* there is no reference to how substantive the evidence needs to be.

**Woodbridge Town Council objects to downgrading of standards to mere guidance. Further if that objection to the whole of the new wording is not accepted, Woodbridge Town Council strongly recommends that the word 'substantive' is added before 'evidence'.**

## **Policy SCLP 7.2 Parking Proposals and Standards**

In the final paragraph of this policy the new consultation documents revised wording reflects the downgrading evident in paragraph 7.18 in that the need for developer proposals to meet parking standards is optional. The developer only has to *'have regard to'* those standards. There is little point in having standards, which are implicitly obligatory, if they are openly stated to not be a required standard.

**Woodbridge Town Council objects to the additional wording in the final paragraph of this Policy.**

## **Policy SCLP 8.2 Open Space**

in paragraph 1 line 5 the requirement on developers to contribute to provision of open space and recreational facilities has been amended to an expectation which open the door to developer's arguments of an inability to afford to contribute. Open space is a necessary important prerequisite to community mental and physical well-being as stated in unchanged paragraph 8.10.

Woodbridge Town Council objects to the downgrading of a requirement to an expectation for developers to contribute.

#### **Policy SCLP 11.1 Design Quality**

In paragraph 2 h) the new consultation document sentence addition and deletion of previous text is applauded and **Woodbridge Town Council support this change to the policy.**

The change in the first line of penultimate paragraph reduces the obligation on developers of major residential developments in relation to Building for Life 12 guidelines. In the January 2019 Final Draft Local Plan this was 'required' but in the new consultation document is only 'expected'.

Woodbridge Town Council object to the revised wording of the penultimate paragraph as it downgrading the requirement for quality built on major residential developments. Such developments are those it considers most able to afford to meet Building for Life 12 guidelines.

#### **Policy SCLP 11.5 Conservation Area**

The addition of paragraph 3 in the new consultation document removes the obligation, where a development affects the setting of a Conservation Area , to '*Preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area*' and '*Retain features important to settlement form and pattern such as open spaces....*'. Woodbridge Town Council considers this allows development to harm the character of the Conservation Area including impacting on important aspects such as of green spaces around the Conservation Area.

Woodbridge Town Council objects to the addition of the third paragraph in this policy.

Woodbridge Town Council supports the amendments to the fourth paragraph of the new consultation document as it reinforces its desire to retain non-listed buildings providing a positive contribution to a Conservation area.

#### **Policy SCLP 11.9 Areas to be protected from Development**

This policy incorporated in all previous drafts of the Local Plan has been deleted in its entirety. There is no evidence that an attempt has been made to review those areas no longer to be protected by the former Policy 11.9 to preserve areas of particular importance to local communities. Our understanding of the following abstract from East Suffolk Council's letter of 14 February 2020 to the Planning Inspectorate is that it had decided to not provide evidence to support the retention of Policy 11.9.

*'In response to your concluding paragraph, the Council is fully committed to adopting a sound Local Plan as soon as practicable and we will not be requesting any additional time in connection with the matters on which you have offered the opportunity for more*

*evidence to be prepared. The Council will not be preparing additional evidence in relation to Areas to be Protected from Development.'*

This is in our view a regrettable approach and one that was not communicated to local town and parish councils on this decision.

We also consider it unreasonable that the Planning Inspectorate deem it appropriate to require the deletion of this policy in its letter of 31 January 2020, at this late stage of development of the Local Plan.

Woodbridge Town Council are advised that such spaces could be so protected by incorporation of them in a Neighbourhood Plan as Local Green Spaces. Such spaces may also be able to be protected by designation under other policies but this is likely to require access to Suffolk County Council's Suffolk Archives (the former County Record Office). All branches of that organisation have been closed since the new consultation document has been published.

In Woodbridge Town Council's view the belated, and disturbing, late stage deletion of a key local planning policy negates the ability of towns and parishes such as Woodbridge Town Council to prepare and have approved a Neighbourhood Plan that protects such areas prior to the expected adoption date of the Local Plan. This is unacceptable.

**Woodbridge Town Council strongly objects to the deletion of Policy SCLP 11.9 Areas to be protected from Development.**

Woodbridge Town Council is of the opinion that the late deletion of this Policy associated with

- the impossibility of preparing, and getting approved, a Neighbourhood Plan to address issues arising from the deletion prior to adoption of the Local Plan
- restrictions on access to documents of relevance due to COVID-19

means the consultation process is compromised.

Woodbridge Town Council thus call for the consultation to be halted until such time as an acceptable means of addressing the impact of the deletion of Policy SCLP 11.9 Areas to be protected from Development is achieved.

#### **Policy SCLP 12.33 Land at Woodbridge Town Football Club**

In paragraph 2 of the new consultation document there is deletion of the following words from the January 2019 Final Draft Local Plan

*'which provide equivalent or better provision of football club facilities within a location which is accessible to the community by non-car modes of transport.'*

The Woodbridge Town Football Club provides a sports facility for young people over a wide area encompassing communities outside normal pedestrian travel distances. It is reliant on retaining those young people for its continuance, in terms of their involvement and thereby obtaining funding by national sports bodies. It is also essential to gain that funding to have at least equivalent facilities to those it currently enjoys.

**Woodbridge Town Council thus objects to the removal of the wording in paragraph as it will cause harm to local facilities that aid the physical and mental well-being of its residents and those in outlying parishes supporting the club.**

**Members are to agree the response to East Suffolk Council**