

# Development Control Committee

**Minutes** of a meeting of the **Development Control Committee** held on **Wednesday 24 April 2024** at **10.00am** in the **Conference Room, Mildenhall Hub**, Sheldrick Way, Mildenhall IP28 7JX

Present **Councillors**

**Chair** Andrew Smith

**Vice Chair** Jon London

Peter Armitage

Carol Bull

Roger Dicker

Susan Glossop

Rachel Hood

Ian Houlder

Sara Mildmay-White

Andy Neal

David Smith

Jim Thorndyke

Don Waldron

## 437. **Chair's Announcements**

The Chair welcomed all present and advised the Committee that the meeting was to be livestreamed, however, neither the public gallery or the registered speakers would be seen visually.

He also reminded Members that as the meeting was being held at Mildenhall Hub the microphones would not operate the 'queue to speak' function and Members needed to raise their hand if they wished to speak.

## 438. **Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mike Chester, Lora-Jane Miller-Jones, Marilyn Sayer and Phil Wittam.

## 439. **Substitutes**

The following substitution was declared:

Councillor Peter Armitage substituting for Councillor Marilyn Sayer

## 440. **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 3 April 2024 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

## 441. **Declarations of interest**

There were no declarations of interest made.

442. **Planning Application DC/22/1693/FUL - Land at Brandon Road, Eriswell (Report No: DEV/WS/24/018)**

**Planning application - operation of a concrete batching plant for temporary period of 3 years**

This application was referred to the Development Control Committee following consideration by the Delegation Panel. One of the Lakenheath Ward Members and a neighbouring Ward Member for Brandon East had raised concerns regarding increased traffic, impact upon the landscape and the consultation responses from Ecological consultees. No comments had been received from the Parish Council.

A Member site visit was held on 22 April 2024, in relation to which the Lawyer advising the meeting explained, for the purposes of transparency, that the applicant had provided a minibus for Members to navigate the application site during their visit due to Health & Safety requirements. Accordingly, the applicant was present during the site visit on the minibus and responded to some questions posed by the Committee. However, his responses only referred to matters covered within the application documentation and the Committee report, no additional information was provided.

Officers were recommending that the application be approved subject to conditions as set out in Paragraph 73 of Report No DEV/WS/23/018.

As part of her presentation to the meeting the Senior Planning Officer explained that the proposed batching plant would represent a small element within the larger, existing site. The storage of aggregates and machinery necessary for the recycling centre already had permission (granted by Suffolk County Council as it was a waste recycling site) and could not be changed by the application seeking determination.

Speaker: Ryan Holbrook (applicant) spoke in support of the application

Considerable debate took place, with Members of the Committee asking a number of detailed questions which the Case Officer responded to as follows: Temporary Permission – if granted, on conclusion of the three-year temporary permission period a further planning application would be required if the applicant wished to continue the same operation on site. Members were reminded that planning policy considerations were the same regardless of whether an application was made for a permanent or temporary scheme; Bunding – the bunding beyond the northern and eastern boundaries of the recycling centre did not form part of the application; Hours of Operation – would be the same as the recycling plant which was 0700-1700 Monday to Friday, 0700-1200 Saturday, closed on Sundays.

During further discussion, the consideration of an application by Norfolk County Council earlier that same week was referenced, in that it concerned a nearby site at Brandon Rail Sidings which operated as an aggregate storage and distribution centre, with the importation of aggregates by rail and export by road.

Concerns had been raised in respect of that application in relation to the impact it had on Brandon with increased traffic movements, noise, dust and mud. Councillors Andy Neal and Rachel Hood raised similar issues with the application before the Development Control Committee.

Councillor Jon London suggested that additional conditions could be appended to the permission in respect of wheel washing, the production of a traffic management plan that linked to that required by Norfolk County Council for the aforementioned application, and a requirement for the recycled materials on the site to be used by the batching plant in order to reduce traffic movements.

In response to further questions raised the Service Manager (Planning – Development) explained:

Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) – it was very common for a shadow/informative HRA to be produced by an applicant, however, the Planning Authority would still then undertake their own HRA as referenced in the report; and

Stone Curlew – Members were advised that developments of main concern to stone curlew nesting sites were residential. In contrast, industrial development had not been found to lead to increased numbers of individuals using the countryside for recreation, leading to disturbance.

Debate took place on the applicant's statement that the proposal would have a modest increase on traffic movements from the site with an approximately 12% increase.

Members queried what this meant in real terms in respect of actual numbers and the Senior Planning Officer advised that the planning statement indicated five additional vehicle movements per day to the site.

Councillor Carol Bull questioned whether the siting of the concrete batching plant on the same site as the existing recycling centre would actually reduce vehicle movements in respect of transporting the aggregate.

Some Members asked if the site would be supplying the other local USAF occupied bases alongside Lakenheath i.e. Mildenhall and Feltwell.

Councillor Andy Neal reiterated his concerns that the scheme would impact neighbouring villages such as Lakenheath and Eriswell in relation to increased traffic movements by large vehicles. He also pointed out the proximity of residential properties and a high school opposite the site who could be impacted by noise and dust.

Accordingly, Councillor Neal proposed that the application be deferred in order to allow additional Officers time in which to clarify matters concerning noise, traffic movement numbers and to allow Eriswell Parish Council further opportunity to make representation on the application, if they wished. This was duly seconded by Councillor Rachel Hood.

Upon being put to the vote and with 7 voting for the motion and 6 against, it was resolved that

Decision

Consideration of the application be **DEFERRED** in order to allow Officers additional time in which to clarify matters concerning noise, traffic movement numbers and to allow Eriswell Parish Council further opportunity to make representation on the application, if they wished.

The meeting concluded at 11.08am

**Signed by:**

**Chair**

---