

**THURSTON PARISH COUNCIL**

MINUTES of the Thurston Planning Committee MEETING held on Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> December 2020 at 7.00pm by VIDEOCONFERENCE of Thurston Parish Council. It was confirmed that, given the significant matters to be discussed, the planning meeting had been opened to all Parish Councillors.

**Present (by video):** Cllrs. Dashper (Chair), Haley, Morris, Rainbow, Towers, Thurlbourn, Turner and West. Also in attendance (by video): Mrs V Waples, Parish Clerk and two members of the public.

1. **OPENING** – the Chairman opened the meeting advising all that the Video Protocol adopted by the Parish Council, would be enacted for this meeting. *A copy of the Protocol is available from the Clerk or can be downloaded from the website: <https://thurstonparishcouncil.uk/parish-council/policies-procedures-and-strategy/>.*
2. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE** –
  - a) Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs. Cornell and Hay due to work commitments.
  - b) Council consented to accept the apologies submitted.
3. **DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY AND NON-PECUNIARY INTEREST FROM COUNCILLORS INCLUDING GIFTS OF HOSPITALITY EXCEEDING £25** –
  - a) To receive declarations of pecuniary, local non-pecuniary interest(s) and personal interests in items on the agenda and their nature including gifts of hospitality exceeding £25 – there were no declarations declared for the agenda under discussion.
  - b) To receive declarations of lobbying for planning matters on the agenda – there were none declared.
  - c) To receive requests for dispensations – none had been received prior to the meeting.
4. **TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE FOLLOWING MEETINGS:** (all as previously circulated) and to agree that delegated authority be given to the Chair to sign the minutes outside of the meeting:
  - a) Minutes of the planning committee meeting of 11<sup>th</sup> November 2020 - all agreed that the minutes as presented were a true and accurate record of the meeting that took place, aif.
5. **PUBLIC FORUM:** *due to government advice relating to public meetings, it was confirmed that the Meeting ID and Password for this meeting had been made available via the website and the parish noticeboards for those who wished to join the meeting* –
  - a) The Clerk made the meeting aware that she had been asked to clarify the issue of the extent of the footpath bordering Norton Road on the Linden Homes Development. It was agreed that there appeared to be an inaccuracy in not only the fall of the path but also how the path was to join the main connectivity point for pedestrians from Meadow Lane. It is expected that this new path will link improvements on Norton Road to the new Primary School via the front of the Linden site but that which has been installed does not reflect the connectivity. It was also confirmed that the landscape plans from Linden Homes have indicated that the existing hedgerow will be reinforced to provide a continuous hedgerow which should ultimately be impenetrable. The Clerk confirmed that having been made aware of the issues she had referred it back to the Planning Officer for appropriate action.
  - b) To consider whether the Parish Council should request further action by the District Council in the case of APPEAL Ref. 3238782. It was noted that this related to the refusal of Planning Permission dated 29<sup>th</sup> March by MSDC and the email trail from a resident requesting whether the Parish Council could discuss further the grounds of the enforcement of the appeal and whether it could intervene further in this matter. It was confirmed that whilst the conditions were inaccurately stated in terms of timeline for enforcement and that this was down to the LPA and Planning Inspector, it was agreed that the PC was not in a position of influence. However, it was agreed that it could request the LPA for details as to when it intends commencing enforcement procedures and whether this would be in conformity with the assumed deadline of 17<sup>th</sup> December 2020, aif.

So approved at the meeting of 27.01.2021

6. **Publication of the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Pre-Submission Joint Local Plan (Regulation 19) (November 2020) – Council are invited to make representations on the legal compliance and soundness of the Pre-Submission Joint Local Plan (Regulation 19) document by 12 noon on Thursday 24<sup>th</sup> December 2020** - the Clerk explained that the scope of the Regulation 19 was to invite representations on the legal compliance and soundness of the plan.

Legal compliance – did it meet all necessary legal steps and requirements in the production of a local plan – all agreed it was legally compliant.

Soundness – as defined in national policy – was it positively prepared; was it justified; was it effective and consistent with NPPF. The meeting agree that whilst the plan might meet the needs of the area overall, it failed to meet the direct needs of individual communities and that having consideration to the options and alternatives it was not sound. It was further agreed that the main thrust of the arguments as far as the Parish Council was concerned were - is the plan compliant with the NPPF. It was agreed by all that the PC did not regard the plan as being compliant as it failed to accord with the Thurston NDP; it failed to take into account existing allocations; it failed to set realistic targets for growth and that in its preparation it had failed to be fully in conformity with made NDPs. It was questioned as to whether any challenges to the numbers set would impact on whether MSDC would be able to achieve its targets in terms of numbers required. Where there is a conflict with the NPPF which takes preference – a made ND plan or the emerging plan? It was agreed that MSDC have drawn a development boundary which is in conflict with that of the NDP and that in their calculations the numbers equated to 999 and not 1489. All agreed that soundness of the plan is to be challenge with specific objections to the allocations, aif.

7. **West Suffolk Planning Policy Consultations - West Suffolk Local Plan (Regulation 18) Issues and Options October 2020 – invitation to participate in the West Suffolk Local Plan (Regulation 18) Issues and Options October 2020 consultation by the consultation manager, West Suffolk Planning Policy - consultation open from 13 Oct 2020 at 09:00 to 22 Dec 2020 at 17:00** – it was agreed that the potential sites to the East of Bury St Edmunds were the most concerning. Proposed development reaches all the way to Valley Corner and was not part of the current Morton Hall Development. Such ribbon development is of a concern. No infrastructure to manage the further development. Note the 999 development for Thurston. All were in agreement that the development to the east and the proximity of development to Thurston should be raised, aif.

**8. PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO BE CONSIDERED:**

- a) DC/20/05022 – Submission of details (reserved matters in part) following Outline Approval DC/19/05114. Appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the erection of 9 No self-build dwellings. Phase 6 Plot 5 @ land south of Barrells Road - it was agreed that the comments raised as under previous applications for this site remained valid in terms of housing type; landscaping; impact on biodiversity, lighting and that NDP policies 4, 9, 11 and 12 should be referenced, aif.
- b) DC/20/05105 - Submission of details (reserved matters in part) following Outline Approval DC/19/05114. Appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the erection of 9 No self-build dwellings. Phase 8 Plot 7 @ land south of Barrells Road - it was agreed that the comments raised as under previous applications for this site remained valid in terms of housing type; landscaping; impact on biodiversity, lighting and that NDP policies 4, 9, 11 and 12 should be referenced, aif.
- c) DC/20/05180 – Full planning application – erection of 1 No dwelling and access (following demolition of two outbuildings) @ Poplar Farm, Great Green – it was noted by all that the comments raised previously by the Parish Council still held weight and reference should be made to the recent Appeal Decision by the Planning Inspector for a similar new dwelling in the countryside and the comments made with regards to the Thurston NDP and Policy 1 of the Plan which sought to focus new development within the defined boundary for Thurston Village unless proposals coming forward met specialist housing and care need on sites beyond the boundary. It was also agreed that no new papers

So approved at the meeting of 27.01.2021

had been submitted and that previous applications had been turned down at appeals. Recommendation for refusal was agreed by all using similar arguments as previously raised, aif.

- d) DC/20/05236 – householder planning application – erection of single storey rear extension to form kitchen/breakfast room and utility room @ 27 Maltings Garth – all noted that this was a flat roof extension – similar to that of a neighbouring property and as such would have no impact on neighbouring amenities. Agreed to support was forthcoming by all present, aif.

**9. To consider further matters under planning applications already submitted:**

- a) Linden Homes - Meadow Lane and pedestrian connectivity from adjacent developments – Council to consider whether it wishes to submit a response on the following:

- Landscape plans for the hedgerow along the new path on Norton Road – it was agreed that the plans uploaded onto the planning portal still did not contain significant details for the hedgerow or landscaping being offered. The Clerk was asked to enquire why this was deemed acceptable and how could the application be judged with such limited detail?
- Landscape plans (Phase 2) for the northern most end of Meadow Lane – again the same comment held weight – limited details and in particular treatment of existing hedgerow, why is this deemed acceptable?
- Provision of access to Meadow Lane for walking and access to the retained woodland within Phase 2 & to allow pedestrian to work their way safely through the Linden Development to get to the new primary school from the Gladman development on land east of Ixworth Road – it was agreed that the proposal for the footpath leading onto Meadow Lane to give connectivity with the Gladman site and across to the Community College and further afield was positive and that this should be installed further down Meadow Lane as a connection onto the Linden Homes Estate should be at the earliest opportunity as opposed to be opposite the cottages on Meadow Lane. In principle, the Parish Council supported a public footpath onto the green part of Meadow Lane but its location needed further clarification, aif.
- Whether it wishes to make any further comments to the Reserved Matters as submitted under: DC/20/01716 and DC/20/01249 – all agreed that the Parish Council's previous comments on the matters submitted still stood and that it did not wish to comment further at this stage.

- b) DC/19/05114 – to receive an update on the following items as raised:

Archaeology - DC/19/05114 - in response to the lack of a condition imposed relating to Archaeology the Clerk made the meeting aware of the following comment from the Planning Officer concerned which stated that no condition had been applied to the outline application DC/19/05114 as the conditions were requested based on the currently unknown status of the development site and no evidence was provided by the Archaeology Team to suggest there were any archaeological implications within the site. It was also stated that the original application DC/17/03268 for 6 dwellings, on the same site, received no comments from the Archaeology Team. When assessing the application DC/19/05114 this was given material weight and considered unreasonable for these conditions to be imposed, in the interests of consistency.

HGV Deliveries Management Plan (DMP) – in response to concerns raised by the Clerk and residents over the Construction Management Plan for the above site, the MSDC Planning Enforcement Officer has stated that a Construction Management Plan (CMP), detailing HGV traffic movements to and from the site was submitted to the planning authority for approval on 19<sup>th</sup> June 2020 under Discharge of Condition application ref DC/20/02443. As such the condition as worded had been complied with. As the consultation response from SCC Highways did not object to the CMP submitted and the delivery routes proposed within, the CMP and consequently the requirements of the condition have been approved. It was also stated that the recommendation from Highways for a road conditions survey as part of their response was merely a recommendation and not a condition.

So approved at the meeting of 27.01.2021

Landscaping – in response to concerns raised by the Clerk and residents at the breach of the condition requiring the submission and approval of landscaping schemes for those for those plots that have progressed to slab level and above, it was confirmed that in accordance with normal enforcement policy any further action is held in abeyance whilst the details that have now been submitted, are duly considered. It was confirmed that details had been submitted for the discharge of these conditions.

**10. PLANNING APPLICATIONS DETERMINED:** to receive details of the planning application considered by Mid Suffolk District Council:

- a) DC/20/4215 – planning permission for the erection of single storey rear extension @ 28 Oakey Field Road
- b) DC/20/03764 – planning permission for the installation of external air conditioning units @ Little Cedars, 58 Barton Road
- c) DC/20/04058 - Refusal of planning permission for the erection of raised decked platform (retention of) @ Maple House, Church Road
- d) DC/20/04289 – planning permission for the erection of single storey rear and single storey front extension (following demolition of rear lean-to conservatory and front porch/conservatory). Replace all external windows and doors @ 8 The Hambros
- e) DC/20/05102 – Discharge of conditions for 5070/16 – Condition 13 (Site investigation and post investigation assessment), Condition 25 (Flood Risk Asset Register) and Condition 27 (Fire Hydrant Position) @ land on the North Side of Norton Road

**11. APPEALS DETERMINED:** to receive details of appeals determined by the Planning Inspectorate:

- a) Appeal ref: APP/W3520/W/20/3254850 – land north of Poplar Farm Lane, Great Green – erection of a detached dwelling (self build) – appeal is dismissed – the meeting noted the comment made by the Inspector with regards to the Thurston NDP and Policy 1 of the Plan which sought to focus new development within the defined boundary for Thurston Village unless proposals coming forward met specialist housing and care need on sites beyond the boundary.

**12. TO CONFIRM THE DATE OF THE NEXT PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING:**

- a) 6<sup>th</sup> January 2021 – via Zoom - commencing at 7.00pm.

**13. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING** – there being no other business the meeting was closed at 8.08pm.

## Appendix A - Glossary of Common Abbreviations used

Aif	All in favour
AGAR	Annual Governance and Accountability Return
APM	Annual Parish Meeting
ASB	Anti-social Behaviour
BACS	Bankers Automated Clearing Services
BUAB	Built Up Area Boundary
BMSDC	Babergh & Mid Suffolk District Councils
CC	Credit Card
CCG	Clinical Commissioning Group
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
Chq.	Cheque
Cllr.	Councillor
CMP	Construction Management Programme
Cttee.	Committee
DC	District Council
DCLG	Department of Communities and Local Government
DD	Direct Debit
EHO	Environmental Health Officer
FOI	Freedom of Information
FR	Financial Regulations
GPoC	General Power of Competence
HMRC	Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs
HRA	Habitats Regulations Assessment
JR	Judicial Review
LAIS (from SALC)	Local Association's Information Services
LGBCE	Local Government Boundary Commission for England
LPA	Local Planning Authority
MSDC	Mid Suffolk District Council
NHS	National Health Service
NDP	Neighbourhood Development Plan
NP	Neighbourhood Plan
NR	Network Rail
PC	Parish Council
PCSO	Police Community Support Officer
Pdf	Portable Document Format
PIISG	Parish Infrastructure Investment Steering Group
Rec.	Recreation
RFO	Responsible Financial Officer
SARS	Suffolk Accident Rescue Service
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
SALC	Suffolk Association of Local Councils
SCC	Suffolk County Council
SID	Speed Indicator Device
SNT	SaferNeighbourhood Team
SO	Standing Order
SPS	Suffolk Preservation Society
TCC	Thurston Community College
TNPSG	Thurston Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group
TPO	Tree Preservation Order
TRO	Traffic Regulation Order
VAS	Vehicle Activated Sign

So approved at the meeting of 27.01.2021