

Development Control Committee

Minutes of a meeting of the **Development Control Committee** held on **Wednesday 7 August 2019** at **10.00 am** in the **Conference Chamber, West Suffolk House, Western Way, Bury St Edmunds IP33 3YU**

Present: **Councillors**

Chair Andrew Smith

Vice Chair Mike Chester and Jim Thorndyke

Carol Bull

John Burns

Terry Clements

Jason Crooks

Andy Drummond

David Gathercole

Susan Glossop

Andy Neal

David Palmer

David Smith

Peter Stevens

Don Waldron

Ann Williamson

16. **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Roger Dicker, Ian Houlder and David Roach.

17. **Substitutes**

The following substitutions were declared:

Councillor Andy Neal substituting for Councillor Roger Dicker

Councillor Carol Bull substituting for Councillor Ian Houlder

Councillor Terry Clements substituting for Councillor David Roach

18. **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 3 July 2019 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

19. **Planning Application DC/19/1146/FUL - Land off Crown Lane, Crown Lane, Ixworth (Report No: DEV/WS/19/008)**

Planning Application - Access road to serve residential development comprising 77 no dwellings - (resubmission of DC/17/0339/FUL)

This application was referred to the Development Control Committee as it related to a major planning application.

A Member site visit was held prior to the meeting. The Parish Council objected to the proposal which was contrary to the Officer recommendation of

approval, subject to conditions as set out in Paragraph 66 of Report No DEV/WS/19/008.

The application had been submitted following the refusal of a similar application in January 2019 by St Edmundsbury Borough Council's Development Control Committee (DC/17/0339/FUL).

The application was refused due to the fact that the proposed access road encroached upon the established tree belt alongside the A143 and insufficient information had been submitted by the applicant to establish the full impact that the proposal could have on the tree belt.

As part of her presentation the Principal Planning Officer drew attention to the changes that had been to the scheme since the application that was considered in January 2019.

The Committee was also advised that an application for the construction of 77 dwellings on land to the South of the access road was still pending consideration; with the Local Planning Authority in the process of engaging with the applicant on matters relating to viability, design and layout.

Speaker: Councillor Ben Lord (Chairman, Ixworth & Ixworth Thorpe Parish Council) spoke against the application
Stuart McAdam (Persimmon Homes, applicant) spoke in support of the application

Considerable detailed discussion took place on the application, in response to which the Principal Planning Officer explained:

Ecology – Condition Nos 6 and 7 had been included at the request of the Landscape and Ecology Officer. Members were also reminded that the tree belt was not protected.

Flooding – the entire site had been assessed for flood risk, including that of the application and the adjacent residential application site.

Road Route / Cycle Path – the road was intended to largely follow the topography of the site with the cycle path to be on the Western side of the road and not adjacent to the tree belt.

Emergency Access / Bollards – the collapsible bollards specified for use at the emergency access were requested by Suffolk County Council Highways and were used as standard.

Condition No 21 – Members were advised of the justification for this condition and informed that it was not possible to link this in any way to the adjacent residential application. However, Suffolk County Council Highways were mindful of the linkage and both schemes would need to comply with the Highways Authority's requirements.

Councillor Peter Stevens raised specific concern that the Crown Lane Masterplan was yet to have been confirmed and questioned the validity of the application in light of this. He therefore, proposed that the application be refused for this reason and this was duly seconded by Councillor Terry Clements.

The Service Manager (Planning – Development) appreciated that it would have been preferable for the related masterplan to have been agreed but

advised that the fact that it was not in place was not a valid reason to refuse the application, and Members needed to be mindful of the length of time that a masterplan took to develop and establish.

In response to the Officer's comments Councillor Peter Stevens withdrew his motion for refusal and instead proposed that the application be approved, as per the Officer recommendation, and this was duly seconded by Councillor Mike Chester.

Upon being put to the vote and with 5 voting for, 10 against and with 1 abstention the Chairman declared the motion lost.

Further debate then ensued with Members continuing to raise concern/seek further detail specifically in connection with:

Ecology – Condition Nos 6 and 7 and the tree belt;

Emergency Access / Bollards – Questions were raised as to whether the collapsible bollards specified for use at the emergency access could be replaced by a gate; and

Condition No 21 – Seeking assurance from Suffolk County Council Highways with regard to the linkage to the adjacent residential application.

In light of these points, Councillor Terry Clements proposed that consideration of the application be deferred in order to allow Officers time in which to pursue these matters. This was duly seconded by Councillor David Gathercole and with the vote being unanimous, it was resolved that

Decision

Consideration of the application be **DEFERRED** in order to allow additional time for Officers to seek further information in respect of:

Ecology – Condition Nos 6 and 7 and the tree belt;

Emergency Access / Bollards – Questions were raised as to whether the collapsible bollards specified for use at the emergency access could be replaced by a gate; and

Condition No 21 – Seeking assurance from Suffolk County Council Highways with regard to the linkage to the adjacent residential application.

20. **Planning Application DC/19/0344/FUL - Liberty House, Hepworth Road, Market Weston (Report No: DEV/WS/19/009)**

Retrospective Planning Application - Change of use from single dwelling house (use Class C3) to a holiday let property (sui generis)

This application was referred to the Development Control Committee following consideration by the Delegation Panel where, due to the public interest in the application, Members resolved that it should be presented to the Development Control Committee.

A Member site visit was held prior to the meeting. The Parish Council objected to the application which was in conflict with the Officer recommendation of approval, subject to conditions, as set out in Paragraph 92 of Report No DEV/WS/19/009.

As part of his presentation the Senior Planning Officer tabled a copy of the noise policy which the applicant's had implemented for all bookings at the property.

Speakers: Nigel French (neighbour objector) spoke against the application
Robert Snelling (neighbour objector) spoke against the application
Councillor Miranda Martin (Vice Chairman, Market Weston Parish Council) spoke against the application
Councillor Carol Bull (Ward Member: Barningham) spoke on the application on behalf of village residents
Juliet Hargrave (applicant) spoke in support of the application

Considerable debate took place by Members with a number commenting on the lack of amenity that village residents received directly from the premises (when operating as a holiday let) together with the limited control the Local Authority had on businesses of this nature.

Some of the Committee also remarked on the distinctive rural nature of Market Weston and how noise travels much further in the countryside, thereby, affecting amenity even if noise levels fell below statutory nuisance legislation.

In response to questions, the Lawyer advising the meeting explained that one of the tests for proposed conditions was enforceability. Hence, Officers did not recommend the inclusion of a condition in relation to the control of noise levels in relation to when and where music was played as this could be covered by other legislation, however, as referenced in the comments by Public Health and Housing, a condition could be included in respect of external lighting.

The Service Manager (Planning - Development) added that a noise management plan could also be requested via a condition.

Councillor Peter Stevens asked if it would be possible for permission to be granted on a temporary basis and the Service Manager (Planning - Development) confirmed that she considered this to be reasonable in this instance and would recommend a temporary period of 1 year.

Accordingly, Councillor Stevens proposed that the application be approved, as per the Officer recommendation, for a temporary period of 1 year, inclusive of a noise management plan and a lighting condition. This was duly seconded by Councillor Don Waldron.

(Prior to taking the vote the Chair permitted a short comfort break.)

Upon being put to the vote and with 8 voting for the motion, 7 against and with 1 abstention, it was resolved that

Decision

Planning permission be **GRANTED FOR A TEMPORARY PERIOD OF 1 YEAR** subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the approved plans and documents.
- 2 Within 3 months from the date of this permission, details of the areas to be provided for the storage and presentation of Refuse/Recycling bins shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
The approved scheme shall be carried out in its entirety within 2 months from the date of the details being agreed by the LPA and shall be retained thereafter for no other purpose
- 3 Within 3 months from the date of this permission, details of biodiversity enhancement measures to be installed at the site, including details of the timescale for installation, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any such measures as may be agreed shall be installed in accordance with the agreed timescales and thereafter retained as so installed.
- 4 Within 6 months from the date of this planning permission, the holiday let property hereby approved shall be provided with an operational electric vehicle charge point at a reasonably and practicably accessible location, with an electric supply to the charge point capable of providing a 7kW charge.
- 5 Noise Management Plan.
- 6 External lighting condition.

21. **Planning Application DC/18/2137/HH - Liberty House, Hepworth Road, Market Weston (Report No: DEV/WS/19/010)**

Householder Planning Application (i) single storey side extension (following demolition of existing conservatory) (ii) install sound attenuation fence (Previous Application DC/16/1930/HH)

This application was referred to the Development Control Committee as it related to the previous agenda item (Planning Application DC/19/0344/FUL) and was also considered by the Delegation Panel where Members resolved that it should be presented to the Development Control Committee.

A Member site visit was held prior to the meeting. The Parish Council objected to the application which was in conflict with the Officer recommendation of approval, subject to conditions, as set out in Paragraph 24 of Report No DEV/WS/19/010.

As part of her presentation the Planning Officer explained that the application site had been subject to a number of planning applications over the years, notably an application for a single storey extension to the South East elevation (DC/16/1930/HH) which was granted in November 2016.

Subsequently, an application was submitted to regularise a discrepancy between the approved plan and the constructed extension – which formed the matter under consideration by the Committee.

The Service Manager (Planning – Development) made reference to the related previously (temporarily) approved agenda item for the same premises and

advised Members that all considerations within the report were still relevant together with the addition of policy DM34 which specifically related to extensions to tourism premises.

Speakers: Nigel French (neighbour objector) spoke against the application
Juliet Hargrave (applicant) spoke in support of the application

Councillor Andy Drummond proposed that the application be approved, as per the Officer recommendation. This was duly seconded by Councillor Susan Glossop.

Upon being put to the vote and with the vote being unanimous, it was resolved that

Decision

Planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. Time limit
2. Compliance with plans

22. **Planning Application DC/19/1084/FUL - La Grange House, Fordham Road, Newmarket (Report No: DEV/WS/19/011)**

Planning Application - 1no. dwelling

This application was referred to the Development Control Committee following consideration by the Delegation Panel.

Newmarket Town Council objected to the scheme which was in conflict with the Officer's recommendation of approval, subject to conditions, as set out in Paragraph 47 of Report No DEV/WS/19/011.

A Member site visit was held prior to the meeting.

As part of his presentation the Senior Planning Officer drew attention to the following:

- The 'late papers' that had been issued following publication of the agenda and which set out comments from the Council's Tree Officer and one further associated condition;
- The planning application previously submitted for the site which was considered by Forest Heath District Council's Development Control Committee in February 2019 and refused. The amendments which had been made to this scheme were highlighted to the Committee; and
- The agent for the application had revisited the site in recent days and surveyed the two trees that were to be removed to accommodate the proposed property's driveway, namely T004 Yew tree and T005 Oak tree. It had transpired that the trees were 2.5m nearer to the Fordham Road boundary than previously understood, hence, these trees could now be retained and the only tree loss would be a small group of young Yew trees.

Speakers: Andrew Fleet (on behalf of neighbour objector Edd Dunlop Racing) spoke against the application

Keith Warth (KWA Architects, agent) spoke in support of the application

Councillor Andy Drummond spoke on the application and clarified that whilst he was a member of Newmarket Town Council's Development and Planning Committee he had abstained from voting on the item when considered by the Town Council in order to allow him to take part in the District Council's Committee.

Councillor Drummond objected to the application due to the location of the proposed property, close to a stable block, and the impact it could have on the amenity of the future residents. He therefore proposed, contrary to the Officer recommendation, that the application be refused. This was duly seconded by Councillor David Gathercole.

The Service Manager (Planning – Development) advised that if Members were minded to refuse the application then the Decision Making Protocol would be invoked and Officers would undertake a Risk Assessment prior to a final decision being made on the application by the Committee.

Upon being put to the vote and with 2 voting for the motion and 14 against the Chair declared the motion lost.

Councillor John Burns raised a question in respect of Condition No 12 and the Construction Method Statement. In response, the Service Manager (Planning – Development) clarified that in applications where the Jockey Club Estates were consulted this bespoke condition was included to enable parties to liaise and come to a mutually appropriate arrangement.

Councillor Burns then proposed that the application be approved, as per the Officer recommendation and inclusive of the additional condition within the late papers, this was duly seconded by Councillor Andy Neal.

Upon being put to the vote and with 14 voting for the motion and with 2 against, it was resolved that

Decision

Planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than 3 years from the date of this permission.
2. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the approved plans and documents.
3. The development hereby permitted shall be constructed entirely of the materials detailed within the application hereby approved.
4. Prior to occupation of the development hereby approved, a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected or retained shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The boundary treatment shall be completed before occupation of the buildings, or commencement of the use, or in accordance with a programme agreed

- in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Any existing boundary treatment shall not be uprooted or removed except where in accordance with the approved plan and shall be protected from building operations during the course of development.
5. Prior to the commencement of any development above ground level, details of the sustainable roof system to be installed to the dwelling hereby approved shall be submitted and approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
 6. Prior to any development, site works or clearance, all the existing trees to be retained (as indicated by the approved plans) shall be protected by fences, of a type and position including details of the 'no dig construction area for the driveway to be approved by the Local Planning Authority, erected around each tree or group of trees. Within the areas so fenced, the existing ground level shall be neither raised nor lowered and no materials, temporary buildings, plant, machinery or surplus soil shall be placed or stored thereon. If any trenches for services are required within the fenced areas, they shall be excavated and backfilled by hand and any tree roots encountered with a diameter of 50mm or more shall be left unsevered. (See British Standard BS 5837:1991 entitled "Trees in relation to construction").
 7. Prior to the commencement of development, details of a temporary protective roadway to be installed during the construction of the dwelling hereby approved shall be submitted and approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The roadway as so approved shall be constructed prior to the first delivery of materials and / or plant and equipment to the site and shall be retained for the duration of the construction period.
 8. The dwelling hereby approved shall not be occupied until the area(s) within the site shown on drawing no. 1179-PO3 for the purposes of manoeuvring and parking of vehicles has been provided and thereafter that area(s) shall be retained and used for no other purposes.
 9. The windows installed in the rear elevation shall be triple glazed and thereafter retained as shown on drawing no. 1179-PO6.
 10. Prior to occupation of the new dwelling the 2000mm high Jackoustic Environmental Noise Barrier Fencing shall be constructed as detailed on drawing no. 1179-PO3 and retained thereafter.
 11. Prior to the commencement of any development above ground level, details of the mechanical ventilation system to be installed to the dwelling hereby approved shall be submitted and approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The ventilation system as so approved shall be installed prior to the first occupation of the dwelling and thereafter retained.
 12. Prior to commencement of development, including any works of demolition, a Construction Method Statement shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall provide for:
 - i) The parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors
 - ii) Loading and unloading of plant and materials
 - iii) Site set-up including arrangements for the storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development and the provision of temporary offices, plant and machinery

- iv) The erection and maintenance of security hoarding including external safety and information signage, interpretation boards, decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate
 - v) Wheel washing facilities
 - vi) Measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction
 - vii) A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works
 - viii) Hours of construction operations including times for deliveries and the removal of excavated materials and waste
 - ix) Noise method statements and noise levels for each construction activity including piling and excavation operations
 - x) Access and protection measures around the construction site for pedestrians, cyclists and other road users including arrangements for diversions during the construction period and for the provision of associated directional signage relating thereto.
13. No dwelling hereby approved shall be occupied until the optional requirement for water consumption (110 litres use per person per day) in Part G of the Building Regulations has been complied with for that dwelling.
 14. Prior to first occupation, all dwellings with off street parking shall be provided with an operational electric vehicle charge point at reasonably and practicably accessible locations, with an electric supply to the charge point capable of providing a 7kW charge.
 15. Prior to commencement of development a Horse Racing Working Method Statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This Method Statement shall specify how the construction process will minimise the effect of delivery and construction activities upon the Fordham Road horsewalk and also how noisy development in close proximity to La Grange Stables will be controlled. Any such Method Statement as may be agreed shall be implemented during the construction process. There shall be no development on site unless and until a Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
 16. Prior to the first occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted the amenity space within the red line on drawing No. 1179-P03 shall be provided for use in conjunction with this property. The amenity space as so provided shall thereafter be retained for use in conjunction with this property.
 17. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015 (or any order amending, revoking or re-enacting that Order), no fences, gates or walls shall be erected within the site other than those agreed pursuant to condition 4 above.
 18. Prior to commencement of development a detailed Tree Protection Plan and Arboricultural Method Statement (including any demolition, groundworks and site clearance) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plans should include details of the following:
 1. Measures for the protection of those trees and hedges on the application site that are to be retained,
 2. Details of all construction measures within the 'Root Protection Area' (defined by a radius of dbh x 12 where dbh is the diameter

of the trunk measured at a height of 1.5m above ground level) of those trees on the application site which are to be retained specifying the position, depth, and method of construction/installation/excavation of service trenches, building foundations, hardstandings, roads and footpaths,

3. Detailed schedule of arboricultural supervision,
4. A schedule of proposed surgery works to be undertaken to those trees and hedges on the application site which are to be retained.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Method Statement unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

(On conclusion of this item the Chair permitted a short comfort break.)

23. Planning Application DC/18/2152/FUL & Listed Building Consent Application DC/18/2153/LB - Thripskin Farm, High Street, Thelnetham (Report No: DEV/WS/19/012)

DC/18/2152/FUL Planning Application - Provision of 1 no. agricultural worker's dwelling including conversion of existing single storey outbuilding (following demolition of existing pole barn and shed); change of use of agricultural land to garden. As amended by plans received on 6th and 20th December 2018.

DC/18/2153/LB Application for Listed Building Consent - (i) Demolition of pole barn and shed (ii) Conversion and extension of outbuilding to provide 1 no. agricultural worker's dwelling. As amended by plans received on 6th and 20th December 2018.

These applications were referred to the Development Control Committee following consideration by the Delegation Panel.

The Parish Council supported both applications which, in the case of the planning application, was contrary to the Officer recommendation of refusal for the reasons set out in Paragraph 57 of Report No DEV/WS/19/012.

Officers were also recommending that the application for Listed Building Consent be approved, subject to conditions as set out in Paragraph 58 of the report.

A Member site visit was held prior to the meeting.

Speakers: Councillor Carol Bull (Ward Member: Barningham) spoke on the application on behalf of the applicants
Paul Nunn (applicant) spoke in support of the application

Councillor Peter Stevens raised questions in relation to Class Q Permitted Development rights in respect of the application site which the Service Manager (Planning – Development) responded to.

Councillor Andy Drummond asked if it would be possible to condition the planning application's dwelling to ensure occupancy was restricted to the farm business and Officers confirmed that this could be done.

Councillor Drummond then proposed that the planning application be approved, contrary to the Officer recommendation of refusal, as he considered the dwelling for a key worker to be essential to the operation, and that the Listed Building Consent application be approved as per the Officer recommendation. These were duly seconded by Councillor John Burns.

The Service Manager (Planning – Development) advised that if Members were minded to approve the planning application then the Decision Making Protocol would be invoked and Officers would undertake a Risk Assessment prior to a final decision being made on the application by the Committee.

Accordingly, the Chair agreed to take the vote on each application separately.

With 13 voting for the motion and with 3 against it was resolved that

Decision

Members be **MINDED TO APPROVE PLANNING PERMISSION CONTRARY TO THE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION OF REFUSAL** as they considered the dwelling for a key worker to be essential to the agricultural operation. The application was therefore **DEFERRED** in order to allow a Risk Assessment to be produced for consideration by the Committee at a future meeting.

And, with the vote being unanimous it was resolved that

Decision

LISTED BUILDING CONSENT be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit
2. Schedule of repairs/works to single storey building to be agreed
3. Samples of materials and finishes to be agreed

24. **Planning Application DC/19/0759/TPO - 3 Forest Way, Mildenhall (Report No: DEV/WS/19/013)**

TPO/2007/02 - TPO/1996/06 - Tree Preservation Orders - (i) T1 - 1no. Oak - Fell (ii) T8 - 1no Scots Pine - Fell

This application was referred to the Development Control Committee following consideration by the Delegation Panel.

Officers were recommending to grant consent for the felling of the T1 Oak and to refuse consent for the felling of the T8 Scots Pine.

The Town Council objected to the felling of both trees. A Member site visit was held prior to the meeting.

As part of his presentation the Planning Officer advised Members that negotiation sought to secure changes to the proposal so that limb reduction works took place instead to the Scots Pine.

However, the applicant did not agree to the suggested change from Officers, therefore making the recommendation the split decision as set out in Paragraphs 29 and 30 of Report No DEV/WS/19/013.

Speakers: Bruce Talbot (neighbour objector) spoke against the application
Brenda Carey (applicant) spoke in support of the application

A number of Members made comment, largely opposing the felling of the Oak tree and posing a number of questions in relation to the tree.

In response to which, the Chair invited the Council's Assistant Arboricultural Officer to address the meeting who advised the Committee that:

- The Oak tree was considered to be of medium public amenity value. On balance the replacement planting with a Lime tree would add to the Lime tree avenue that lined the adjacent Thetford Road and this enhancement was considered to be of high public amenity value; and
- Whilst it was difficult to age trees accurately he considered the Oak tree to be over 100 years old and to have entered the last stage of its life.

Councillor Peter Stevens remarked on the Oak tree appearing to straddle the applicant's property and that of the immediate neighbour.

The Service Manager (Planning – Development) advised that if Members granted the felling of the tree then both parties would have to agree to the works, however, this was a matter of common law and not a material planning consideration.

Councillor Andy Neal proposed that the Tree Preservation Order Consent for the felling of the T1 Oak Tree be refused, contrary to the Officer recommendation of approval, due to the high amenity value he considered the tree to provide. This was duly seconded by Councillor Susan Glossop.

Upon being put to the vote and with 15 voting for the motion and with 1 against, it was resolved that

Decision

The Tree Preservation Order Consent for the felling of the **T1 Oak Tree** be **REFUSED, CONTRARY TO THE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL**, due to the high amenity value the tree provided.

And, Councillor Neal also proposed that the Tree Preservation Order Consent for the felling of the T8 Scots Pine be refused, as per the Officer recommendation, This was duly seconded by Councillor Andy Drummond.

Upon being put to the vote and with the vote being unanimous, it was resolved that

Decision

The Tree Preservation Order Consent for the felling of the **T8 Scots Pine** be **REFUSED** for the following reason:

1. The Scots Pine has a significantly high amenity value that contributes considerably to the wooded character of the local and wider area. Due to this high amenity value removal of the tree would need to be supported by additional information on the condition of the tree. No further evidence has been supplied and therefore, in the circumstance, it is not considered that a complete felling of the tree would be justified and would certainly not outweigh the adverse visual impacts that would arise and the removal of this tree would not therefore be justified.

(Prior to taking the vote on this item the Lawyer advised the meeting that whilst Councillor David Gathercole had briefly stepped out of the room during the debate on this matter, whilst he was absent the only advice given by Officers was to highlight something that was not pertinent to the application, therefore Councillor Gathercole was still able to take part in the vote.)

(On conclusion of this item Councillors Susan Glossop, David Palmer and Peter Stevens left the meeting at 2.20pm.)

25. **Planning Application DC/19/0774/HH - 14 Hallfields, Lakenheath (Report No: DEV/WS/19/014)**

Householder Planning Application - Installation of fencing

This application was referred to the Development Control Committee following consideration by the Delegation Panel.

The Parish Council supported the application and Officers were recommending that it be approved, subject to conditions, as set out in Paragraph 22 of Report No DEV/WS/19/014.

A Member site visit was held prior to the meeting.

The Principal Planning Officer explained that throughout the report the fence had been referenced as being 2.2m when in fact it should have read 2.02m.

The Committee were also advised of the 'fallback' Permitted Development option that the applicants could pursue if permission was not granted.

Speaker: Councillor David Gathercole (Ward Member: Lakenheath) spoke on the application

Further to questions/comments made in respect of the property's covenant restrictions in relation to fencing, the Service Manager (Planning – Development) advised Members that this was not a material planning consideration.

Councillor Gathercole proposed that the application be refused, contrary to the Officer recommendation of approval, as he considered it not to comply

with policies DM24 and DM2. This was duly seconded by Councillor Andy Drummond.

Upon being put to the vote and with 10 voting for the motion, 2 against and with 1 abstention it was resolved that

Decision

Planning permission be **REFUSED, CONTRARY TO THE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL**, as it did not comply with policies DM24 and DM2.

The meeting concluded at 2.33pm

Signed by:

Chair
