

THURSTON PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Thurston Planning Committee MEETING held on Wednesday 27th January 2021 at 7.30pm 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), Cornell, Haley, Morris, Rainbow, Thurlbourn, Towers, Turner, and West. Also in attendance (by video): Mrs V Waples, Parish Clerk and three members of the public (two in part).

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) There were no submitted apologies for absence.
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 9th December 2020 – (not 16th December as written on the agenda) - all agreed that the minutes as presented were a true and accurate record of the meeting that took place, aif.
 - b) Minutes of the planning committee meeting of 6th January 2021 - 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* – there were no comments received.
6. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO BE CONSIDERED:**
 - a) DC/20/05894 – Submission of details (reserved matters) for outline planning permission DC/19/03486. Layout, scale, appearance and landscaping to be considered for the construction of 210 dwellings, public open space, play area, sustainable drainage features and associated infrastructure including foul sewerage pumping station @ land south west of Beyton Road
Having reviewed the application the following concerns/issues were raised by those present:
 - Whilst the Energy Statement; Arboricultural Statement and Landscape and Ecological Management Plan contained methods, which if followed would be positive – there was no doubting that the overall development, number of hours worked, length of time on site and impact on bio diversity would have a significant impact on the area. The proposal was in short a disaster in terms of the impact on bio diversity.
 - Arboricultural Method Statement - if followed through would be sound. Particular features that protect trees include: The establishment of root protection areas; shrubs to be removed by hand to protect roots; protection of tree canopies; protected species to be unharmed no trees subject to a TPO to be removed but there are three trees in danger. Trees – T57, T8 and T12. The PC should ensure that at all costs the loss of trees must be prevented.

So approved at the meeting of 17.02.2021

- Poisoning of stumps is allowable with the use of approved chemicals and the PC should object to the use of any chemicals on this site.
- Ecological report – appears to be a contradiction regarding vehicle idling (a significant contributor to poor air quality). Under the section relating to noise and vibration it states: “Plant and equipment will be switched off when not in use including during breaks and down time of more than 30 mins”. Under the section relating to Air Quality the report states: “There shall be no idling vehicles, ensure all vehicles switch off engines when stationary.”. It would suggest that there is an allowance for vehicles to idle for up to 30 mins under “Noise and Vibration” contradicted by the latter statement. Clarification is needed here to ensure that all engines are switched off when stationary.
- There are some mitigation measures being proposed to protect wildlife to limit bio-diversity loss.
- Mitigation / limitation of light spillage - clarification of sentence relating to excess light is required – what is meant by excess and what is meant by sensitive ecological area?
- Stakeholder communication plan - how will this be carried out and how do we ensure this is carried out. The PC must be at the centre of this to ensure that the developers are fully accountable at all stages of development.
- Open Space management – PC should object to the use of chemical weed killer.
- Energy Strategy – The strategy is based on the following in order of priority - Be Lean - Be Clean - Be Green. Issue is that the focus is on insulation and not ventilation and that all forms of solar heating have been rejected. No provision for the collection and re-use of grey water. Emphasis appears to be on fabric first which has failed to move towards passive housing and renewable energy uses.
- Landscape Strategy – why mowing of frontages on a weekly basis? Pressure should be used to adopt some of the proposals as outlined by Place Services in the use of flowering grasses as opposed to amenity grass which are slower growing and do not need cutting so often.
- Proposals for native hedge planting as proposed by Place Services contains more appropriate species than that put forward by the developer.
- Need to question why there was only a 12 month maintenance contract in place and not 5 years as other developers.
- Trees should be tidied up and maintained and that the emphasis as outlined in recent planning consultations is that developers should ensure that they protect what you have rather than cutting down and replanting with something different.
Limited formal planting around the houses. Street trees – where are these? Why is this missing?
Planting is confined to the perimeter of the site and localised areas within the site - again typical of the example of "how not to do it" in the NP. This is not in conformity with the Thurston NDP or the Suffolk Design Code for street scenes.
- Tree due to be removed where new road junction is to be placed – why only the one and retain the other?
- There is only 1 x small green "communal" area at the centre of the development.
- The small play area is on the Western edge of the development and it is next to the attenuation pond and pumping station.
- There is no provision for allotments or dog exercise areas.
- No overall consideration of the PC’s strategy for play. Comment from Public Realm is disappointing and lacking in substance. Should be noted that there are no other play areas in the vicinity of this development.
- **CMP – Environment Management Plan – pg 6 1.4 works programme – 5 years programme – timescales for disruption pg 10 fig 4 CMP planned progression of works – is this binding?
Pg 22 – mitigation of works – made a note that a wheel washer is required – positive but will it be enacted pg 32 – water courses – reduce the run-off of silt into drains – this needs to be enforced given the current weather conditions. Comprehensive document but will it be enforced and will they stick to it.**

So approved at the meeting of 17.02.2021

- Density - outline versus reserved – the Gross Density quoted by MSDC is 23.6 dwellings / hectare, but Bloor's own drawings indicate Nett Densities of 30-45 dph for most of the site;- i.e. far too high for a "rural" development.
- Bungalows – numbers, tenure, location. Affordable housing issues – are they catering for Thurston or MSDC? Has the current provision of affordable housing been taken into account.
- Young catered for but not elderly or those wishing to downsize. There are only 6 x 2 bed bungalows (rent only) and 5 x 3 bed bungalows (private). Most elderly / retirees would probably be seeking 1 - 2 bed bungalows to buy. All the bungalows are concentrated along the Beyton Road boundary - there is no mix within the estate meaning that potentially all the older residents will be in one area - does not promote neighbourly help between the "young" and the "old". The younger generation appears to have been better catered for with 51 x rentable properties and 22 shared ownership properties.
- The housing layout closely resembles the "how not to do it" example in the Neighbourhood Plan - closely packed houses in regimented rows with lots of terraced housing. Much more akin to an urban town centre development.
- Materials – across all areas there is a mixture of red or buff brickwork; render in the main off white with roofs being black slate, grey slate and red/orange pantiles. However some of the houses will resemble sheds with black cladding.
- 11 bungalows – 6 affordable and 5 private – all located in one place along the Beyton Road boundary with no fix within the estate overall.
- Density along Beyton Road is significantly high which is in comparison to the houses to the north of Beyton Road which are of a different density – e.g. Whitefriars – large house that are spread out in a large plot and the effect is totally different.
- Street elevations/design – height of the various storeys from slab height to ridge height are described in the Design and Access Statement which gives the following: 1 storey. 6.5 mtrs; 1.5 storey 8 mtrs; 2 storey 9.5 mtrs and 2.5 storey 11 mtrs. Overall it is crammed – limited variety in terms of architecture. Noted that 10 houses are of 2.5 storey – the PC has always objected to 2.5 storeys and should continue to object to this. Overall consideration given that this is an urban design that does not fit in with a rural village. Yet again these are off the shelf designs.
- Highways plan – Traffic Management designs are as submitted previously and the points raised under the original application in terms of connectivity and highway safety should be repeated. Nothing in the reports submitted show evidence that the issues that were initially raised by the PC have been mitigated.
- Pathway widths - Highways are expecting these to be increased to 2m (the actual widths are not marked on the plans but Highways have assessed them on the scale provided for the drawings). This is on the expectation that there will be shared use of the paths which will promote cycling as a more sustainable form of transport.
- How will this be managed in terms of the path under the bridge?
- Highways have also made a comment about the width of the footpaths and cycleways which should be 2 mtrs wide. How does this correlate with the route under the bridge?
- NR – why no response given that they are an intrinsic part of the solution to ensure that this application is sustainable?
- Two exists – the designs put forward are no different in terms of splay and visibility and mapping areas are similar. RM Floods etc have also queried the run-off with drainage at Fishwick. Medium strips and footways are just generic and have not been designed for the area in which it is to be located.
- Affordable housing – disappointed that Bloor has sought to implement the barest minimum of affordable dwellings – 73 is only 35% of total dwellings which is in accordance with current local policy. Comment by Bloor at outline stage “Whilst the specific housing mix will be a matter for a more detailed application to follow, the intention is to provide a range of house types including

So approved at the meeting of 17.02.2021

bungalows, dwellings built to high accessibility standards, and a variety of house sizes. This would be determined and secured through a detailed application”.

- No details submitted as to the type of affordable housing or the bedroom numbers.
- Layout is not acceptable given that there appears to be ghetto type areas for affordable housing
- Housing for the Elderly / those wishing to downsize - In May 2018 the Government’s ONS 2016-based sub-national population projections were published and these show a projected population increase of 16,600 between 2018 and 2036, within BMSDCs. In BMSDC’s Homes and Housing Strategy it is stated that “ A significant percentage of our populations are aged 65 years or above and it is predicted that this age group will account for 1 in 3 people living in Suffolk, compared to 1 in 4 in England over the next 20 years. As a population ages there will be increasing and different demands on services and facilities, especially housing, transport, medical care, and social care services”. None of this has been considered in the reports submitted.
- For the over 55 age bracket there is limited housing – single storey dwellings or 1.5 storeys – contrary to TNDP Policy 2.
- Contrary to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment updated in 2019 which stated that over 34.4% of owner-occupied homes by 2036 would require a smaller house. Therefore the mix of more 3- and 4-bedroom houses needs to be reduced to allow for an increase in 2-bedroom homes as well as more bungalows.
- Car parking – Adequate parking provision must be provided for all housing types. Note comment from SCC Highways on the adequacy and location of visitor parking. Current provision will fail to address the parking on verges and footpaths by visitors and those wishing to access their own dwellings.
- EV parking –BMSDC declared a climate emergency in 2019 with an aspiration to be carbon neutral by 2030. As such there should be sufficient provision of electric vehicle charging infrastructure within new developments coming forth to help meet the governments ambition of all cars and vans being zero emission by 2050.
- There are no electric charging points in the village – surely all new development must have the correct infrastructure to provide each and every home with the correct units to facilitate electric charging in the imminent future?

The meeting agreed to pass delegated responsibility to the Clerk to submit a response for the recommendation of refusal, citing all of the matters previously raised under the outline planning application and to include those raised that evening, aif. It was also noted that the Clerk would ensure that any response given by Thurston Parish Council was made in the knowledge that the outline planning permission for application DC/19/03486 is subject to a Judicial Review challenge and that its response should not in any way be taken as an acceptance that the outline permission is lawful.

It was also agreed that the division of the application into areas to be researched by Councillors and relevant Committees had resulted in a focused and sound debate of the issues which were relevant to the Council and the Thurston NDP.

7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO BE CONSIDERED: affecting or impacting Thurston:

- a) DC/20/2262/RM - Reserved matters application - submission of details under planning permission DC/19/1519/OUT - the means of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the improvements to the junction of New Road and Thurston Road | Land West Of Crossways Cottages Junction New Road/Thurston Road Rougham Suffolk – the meeting noted that the proposals were still in essence the same as that approved at outline stage that it was agreed that the PC should continue to raise its concerns that the staggered junction will result in any vehicles leaving the village to access the A14 for Bury St Edmunds/Cambridge at the slip road by Rougham Hall Nurseries having to turn left and then wait in the middle of Mount Road to turn right. It was also agreed that the PC should make mention

So approved at the meeting of 17.02.2021

of the holding objection from Suffolk County Council, as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) until the flooding risk had been resolved and the fact that the outline planning permission as issued by MSDC which is related to this application is subject to a Judicial Review challenge and should not be taken in any way as acceptance that the outline permission is lawful.

- 8. PLANNING APPLICATIONS DETERMINED:** to receive details of the planning application considered by Mid Suffolk District Council:
- a) Planning Applications determined: to receive details of the planning applications considered by the Local Planning Authority (Mid Suffolk District Council):
 - b) DC/19/03486 - Outline Planning Permission (some matters reserved – access to be considered) – erection of up to 210 dwellings, means of access, open space and associated infrastructure, including junction improvements (with all proposed development located within Mid Suffolk District Council, with the exception of proposed development to Fishwick Corner being within West Suffolk) @ land South West of Beyton Road.
 - c) DC/17/02782 – Outline Planning Permission (access to be considered) – erection of 15 dwellings (including 5 affordable bungalows) @ land off Church Road, access via garden of The Firs
 - d) DC/20/05022 – Approval of Reserved Matters - (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.
 - e) DC/20/05645 – planning permission – erection of a single storey rear extension (following demolition of existing conservatory) @ 11 Maltings Garth
 - f) DC/20/05105 – Approval of Reserved Matters - (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.
 - g) DC/20/02723 – Refusal of planning permission for the erection of two-storey side extension to existing garage to enable conversion to annex; erection of garage @ Mofley Cottage, Barrells Road
 - h) DC/20/05236 – Planning permission for the erection of single storey rear extension to form kitchen/breakfast room and utility room @ 27 Maltings Garth.
 - i) DC/20/05714 – consent to carry out works to a Tree protected by a Tree Preservation Order – MS276/G1 – Sycamore (T013) – reduce double crown by 30-40% and cut back and re-shape (to make safe and stable as right-hand trunk is leaning significantly towards garage building) @ 4 Marley Close.
 - j) DC/20/04834 – planning permission under s73 for removal or variation of conditions relating to DC/19/05386 dated 27/03/2020 – Town and Country Planning Act 1990 – to vary condition 2 (approved plans and documents) to amend the design of the proposal @ Plot 8, land off Cedars Close.
 - k) DC/20/04617 – nonmaterial amendment to DC/17/02232 to enable substitution of house types. No change to mix or overall unit numbers @ land on the West side of Barton Road.
 - l) DC/20/05440 – Discharge of conditions application for DC/20/01981 – Condition 5 (Landscaping scheme) @ land south of Barrell Road
 - m) DC/20/05441 - Discharge of conditions application for DC/20/02236 – Condition 5 (Landscaping scheme) @ land south of Barrell Road
 - n) DC/20/05437 - Discharge of conditions application for DC/20/01802 – Condition 5 (Landscaping scheme) @ land south of Barrell Road
 - o) DC/20/05438 - Discharge of conditions application for DC/20/01803 – Condition 5 (Landscaping scheme) @ land south of Barrell Road
 - p) DC/20/02237 - Discharge of conditions application for DC/20/02237 – Condition 5 (Landscaping scheme) @ land south of Barrell Road
 - q) DC/20/05439 – Discharge of conditions application for DC/20/02211 – Condition 3 (landscaping scheme) – Phase 1 Roadway and Footpath

So approved at the meeting of 17.02.2021

9. **TO CONFIRM THE DATE OF THE NEXT PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING:**
 - a) 17th February 2021 – via Zoom - commencing at 6.00pm.
10. **CLOSURE OF THE MEETING** – there being no other business the meeting was closed at 20.46.

So approved at the meeting of 17.02.2021

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 17.02.2021