

Minutes of the Development Control Committee Meeting held on 20 January 2016 at 10:05 am in the King Edmund Chamber, Endeavour House, Ipswich.

Present: Councillors Peter Beer (Chairman), Graham Newman, (Vice Chairman), Helen Armitage, Stephen Burroughes, Peter Byatt, Jessica Fleming, Christopher Hudson, John Goodwin, Richard Kemp, Bill Quinton, Steve Searle, Reg Silvester and Joanna Spicer.

Supporting officers present: Rebekah Butcher (Democratic Services Officer), Emma Bethell (Principal Planning And Environment Lawyer), Sean Cunniffe (Planning Officer), John Pitchford (Head of Planning) and Anita Seymour (Development Manager).

Before the start of the meeting, Councillor Joanna Spicer paid tribute to Councillor Tim Marks who served on the Committee since his election in May 2015. The meeting recorded its thanks to Councillor Marks and the contribution to the work of the Committee.

47. Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Nick Barber (substituted by Councillor John Goodwin) and Councillor Andrew Stringer.

Councillor Christopher Hudson substituted for the vacant post.

48. Declarations of Interest and Dispensations

There were no declarations made or dispensations given.

49. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 December 2015 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

After hearing Agenda Item 3, the Chairman altered the order of the agenda; the minutes reflect the amended order.

50. Update from the Head of Planning

At Agenda Item 5, the Committee heard an update from the Head of Planning on issues that were raised by Members they understood to be County Policy, which were not tackled in the planning application reports. Specifically: the absence of sprinklers in new school buildings; and the absence of appropriate measures to increase the sustainability of Suffolk County Council buildings.

Members reiterated the importance of receiving formal responses to planning consultations from the statutory consultees. Members also raised concerns of planning officers accepting a 'no response' as approval. Although Members accepted that officers were very busy, they felt the default position should not

be to accept a 'no response' from statutory consultees and to at least make contact with them.

Decision: The Committee agreed to hold an informal meeting and would invite the Cabinet Member for Public Protection and senior officers from the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service.

Reason for decision: This would afford Members the opportunity to express their views and decide on a way forward to create a more transparent and rigorous consultation process.

Alternative options: There were none considered.

Declarations of interest: There were none noted.

Dispensations: There were none granted.

51. Anaerobic digestion plant, associated infrastructure and use of existing agricultural lagoons; Barley Brigg Farm, Stradbroke

The Committee considered a report at Agenda Item 4 which sought to gain consent (part retrospective) for an anaerobic digestion (AD) plant and associated infrastructure at Barley Brigg Farm near Stradbroke. The development was partially constructed and operational.

Consent was granted in 2013 by Mid Suffolk District Council (MSDC) (ref: 3219/12) for an AD facility. However, the 'as built' development differed materially in nature from the originally consented proposal meaning that a new planning consent was required. As the feedstock sources had been amended to include waste, this meant that the proposal fell under the planning remit of Suffolk County Council (SCC) as the Waste Planning Authority.

Members of the Committee had visited the site on 15 January 2016.

The Committee noted the following corrections to the report:

- a) Page 17, paragraph 33 – Change 'HGV movements' to 'large vehicles' (2nd line);
- b) Page 24, paragraph 90 – Change 'vehicle movements' to 'vehicles' (2nd line);
- c) Page 25, paragraph 96 – Change 'Condition 10 in paragraph 6' to Condition 11 in paragraph 8 (3rd line);
- d) Page 25, paragraph 97 – Change 'Condition 11 in paragraph 6' to Condition 12 in paragraph 8 (3rd line);
- e) Page 25, paragraph 97 – Change 'Condition 12 in paragraph 6' to Condition 13 in paragraph 8 (6th line);
- f) Page 25, paragraph 100 – Change two references to 'paragraph 6' to 'paragraph 8' (2nd and 5th lines);
- g) Page 26, paragraph 102 – Change 'paragraph 6' to 'paragraph 8' (2nd line); and
- h) Page 26, paragraph 103 – Replace 'paragraph 6' with 'paragraph 8' (1st line).

Mr Steven Bainbridge (from Evolution Town Planning) spoke on behalf of the applicant. Mr Bainbridge informed the Committee of the benefits of the new application, reiterating that no objections had been received from statutory consultees and there were no adverse effects that could not be mitigated for through conditions. Mr Bainbridge explained the differences between this application and the one granted by MSDC in terms of the operations around feed stocks and traffic, impacts on the landscape, access, noise and odour. He explained that this application would put much more control on the operations of the facility than what had already been granted ending a lot of concerns from local residents. In conclusion, Mr Bainbridge confirmed that the applicant had hosted a number of on-site events for local people and met with the parish councils to explain the application details to them and respectfully asked the Committee to support the officer's recommendation and approve the application.

The registered speaker who objected to the application was unable to attend the meeting. The Chairman opened up the public speaking slot to the public gallery and asked if anybody else would like to speak in their place. Ms Judith Law, a local resident who knew of the registered speaker, addressed the Committee. Ms Law informed the Committee that she was largely in favour of green energy but had concerns in regards to when the monitoring of noise and odours would be done, and if there would be a regular timetable for monitoring of the conditions to ensure they were adhered to.

Decision: On the proposition of Councillor Christopher Hudson, seconded by Councillor Reg Silvester, the Committee unanimously agreed that the application be granted subject to the conditions recommended in the report by the Director of Resource Management.

Reason for decision: In light of the Development Plan and other relevant material considerations, the application was considered to be acceptable and, subject to conditions, was not considered to cause unacceptable impacts upon the environment and local amenity.

Alternative options: It was proposed by Councillor Graham Newman, and seconded by Councillor Joanna Spicer, to grant planning permission providing that an additional condition was added ensuring that all mobile plant activity associated with the movement of feedstock to only be carried out between 08:00 to 18:00 hours except for no more than six weeks per year during harvest time when movement should be restricted to 07:00 to 19:00 hours. A vote was taken. Six members voted in favour of the motion and seven voted against it. Therefore the motion was rejected.

Declarations of interest: There were none noted.

Dispensations: There were none granted.

52. Urgent Business

There was no urgent business.

The meeting closed at 11.55 am.

Chairman

