



Hadleigh Town Council

The Guildhall,
Market Place,
Hadleigh,
Suffolk
IP7 5DN

Tel: 01473 823884

PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Tuesday 13th October 2020 at 7.00pm via video conference

MINUTES

1: Opening	<p>a) The Chair welcomed Councillors and the public Chair noted the Council, members of the public and press may record/film or broadcast this meeting, when the press and public are not lawfully excluded.</p> <p>Councillors attending: McLeod, Schleip (Chair), Bayliss, Gordon, Talbot. Also in attendance: Acting Town Council Manager, and 1 member of the public.</p> <p>b) No apologies for absence were received.</p> <p>c) There were no Members' declarations of pecuniary or non-pecuniary interest.</p> <p>d) No requests for dispensations were made.</p>
2: Public Forum	There were no members of the public wishing to speak.
3: Minutes	Proposed by Councillor Bayliss, Seconded by Councillor McLeod and unanimously agreed, the minutes of the Planning Advisory Committee meeting on 22nd September 2020 were approved.
4: Planning Applications	<p>Councillors considered the following applications for Planning Consent listed below:</p> <p>a) DC/20/04019 application for the erection of a single storey rear extension and conversion of existing garage to additional living space at 65 Stockton Close, Hadleigh, Ipswich, Suffolk IP7 5SH. Proposed by Councillor Schleip, Seconded by Councillor McLeod it was resolved to approve the application</p> <p>b) DC/20/04143 it was noted that the application had been sent out in error by Babergh District Council and had been withdrawn.</p> <p>c) DC/20/04063 it was noted that the application had been withdrawn.</p>
5: Withdrawal of Planning Application	a) DC/20/03088 it was noted that the application had been withdrawn
6: Planning Decision Notices	It was noted that the column advising of the Town Council's decision on Planning Applications had been left blank and was subsequently populated by Councillor Talbot. It was agreed that for future Planning meetings the column will be completed.
7: Planning for the future consultation	It was proposed by Councillor Talbot, seconded by Councillor McLeod and unanimously agreed that the draft response prepared by the previous Town Council Manager be submitted on behalf of Hadleigh Town Council with additional comments from Councillor Schleip.



Hadleigh Town Council

The Guildhall,
Market Place,
Hadleigh,
Suffolk
IP7 5DN

Tel: 01473 823884

8: Future Meetings	The next Planning Advisory Committee meeting will be on Tuesday 27 th October 2020 by video conference.
9. Close of meeting	There being no further business the meeting closed at 7.24pm

Prepared by

Cheryl Tye

Cheryl Tye
Acting Town Council Manager



Hadleigh Town Council

The Guildhall,
Market Place,
Hadleigh,
Suffolk
IP7 5DN

Tel: 01473 823884

PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

HADLEIGH TOWN COUNCIL
Meeting of the Planning Advisory Committee

SCHEDULE OF DECISIONS OF LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

Schedule produced on 7th October 2020

<u>Application No.</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Details of Application</u>	<u>Recommendation of Town Council</u>	<u>Decision of Local Planning Authority</u>
<u>DC/20/03649</u>	Seymour House, Angel Street, Hadleigh, Ipswich Suffolk IP7 5EY	Notification for works to trees in a Conservation Area - 3no Limes - Re-pollard back to previous points on a bi-annual cyclical basis to negate the need for a planning application each time they need pruning.	Support	Does not wish to object
<u>DC/20/03094</u>	West Lodge, George Street, Hadleigh, Ipswich Suffolk IP7 5BE	Application for Listed Building Consent - Erection of single storey rear extension	Recommend approval	Listed building consent has been granted
<u>DC/20/03093</u>	West Lodge, George Street, Hadleigh, Ipswich Suffolk IP7 5BE	Householder Application - Erection of single storey rear extension	Recommend approval	Granted
<u>DC/20/03979</u>	Land South Of, Ipswich Road, Hadleigh, IP7 6BE	Discharge of Conditions Application for DC/17/03902 - Condition 12 (Electric Charging Points)	Didn't come to HTC meeting. Was submitted and decided before it could have come to us anyway	Condition has been discharged to LPA's satisfaction
<u>DC/20/03688</u>	6 Guthrum Road, Hadleigh, Ipswich, Suffolk IP7 5BQ	Application to determine if Prior Approval is required for a Larger Home Extension - Erection of a single storey lean-to extension to rear of property.	Didn't come to HTC meeting	Prior approval to the development is not required
<u>DC/20/03210</u>	Little Chelsea, 34 Dunton Grove, Hadleigh, Ipswich Suffolk IP7 5HD	Development: Householder Application - Erection of single storey side extension with roof lantern and creation of additional parking space (following demolition of attached garage).	Support	Granted
<u>DC/20/03211</u>	Janheir, Boswell Lane, Hadleigh, Ipswich Suffolk IP7 6BX	Erection of 2no. bungalows with associated parking and access (following demolition of existing bungalow and outbuildings).	Support	Granted
<u>DC/20/03510</u>	Former Angel Court Care Home, Hadleigh	Discharge of Conditions Application for DC/18/04812 - Condition 6 (Means to prevent discharge of surface water onto highway), Condition 7 (Loading, Unloading, Manoeuvring & Parking), Condition 9 (Joinery deetails) & Condition 15 (rear boundary treatment)	Didn't come to HTC meeting	Conditions satisfied subject to implementation in accordance with wording of the conditions

<u>DC/20/03020</u>	18 Station Yard, Hadleigh	Planning permission - Erection of rear single storey extension	Support	Planning permission granted
<u>DC/20/03622</u>	Frenchs Farm, Pond Hall Road, Hadleigh	Planning permission - Erection of 1no detached dwelling with associated driveway and landscaping	Support	Planning permission granted
<u>DC/20/02935</u>	Land to rear 17 Gallows Hill, Hadleigh	Discharge of conditions application DC/20/00743 - Condition 9 (Construction Management) & Condition 11 (Tree protection)	Didn't come to HTC meeting	Conditions satisfied subject to implementation in accordance with wording of the conditions
<u>DC/20/03595</u>	Hadleigh Market Feoffment Charity	Planning permission - Replace gas boilers	Support	Planning permission granted
<u>DC/20/03405</u>	Hadleigh Town Council	Listed Building Consent - Replace gas boilers	Support	LBC has been granted

Planning For the Future DRAFT Consultation response by Hadleigh Town Council

Background

On 6th August 2020 the Housing Secretary Robert Jenrick launched consultation on Planning for the Future; a new white paper which sets out sweeping reforms to the planning system in England. These reforms aim to

- streamline and modernise the planning process by removing some of its remit,
- present design quality and sustainability as two key anchors instead of focusing on process,
- reform developer contributions,
- ensuring more land is available where needed for development (this is a key point, as Hadleigh is one of the larger settlements in Babergh, it is likely that it will be the target for much more growth than it has been in the past in order to make up the numbers).

The consultation on Planning for the Future closes on 29th October 2020. It is open to everyone, across public and private sectors as well as the general public. Responses can be made online by emailing planningforthefuture@communities.gov.uk, or writing to the Planning for the Future Consultation at MHCLG in London.

Overview

The emphasis is on 'outcomes', fundamentally interpreted as the numbers of homes that will be delivered, not long-term outcomes in terms of housing and places that promote well-being. It effectively returning planning to its origins of controlling land use, rather than it being seen as an overarching method of addressing social, environmental and economic matters.

Whilst the *National Planning Policy Framework* (NPPF) will stay and be representative of all 'general planning policies', the District Council's *Local Plan* will need to follow a national template, and be prepared and agreed in 30 months, in consultation with local communities. New *Local Plans* will need to identify clear rules for development and classify areas into three zones:

- **GROWTH:** Areas labelled for 'growth' will be approved for development via an outline planning consent at the same time as local plans are prepared, allowing for new homes and infrastructure to be built 'quickly and efficiently', providing that local design standards are met. This is fundamentally the same as the current Local Plan "land Allocations" process such as the Lady Lane Extension.

- **RENEWAL:** Specific uses such as residential, healthcare and education in 'Renewal' areas will benefit from much quicker development, again if they are well-designed. This is also fundamentally the same as the current Local Plan "land Allocations", but whereas "Growth" is about greenfield sites for wholly-new development, "Renewal" sites are about changing existing places.

- **PROTECT:** Areas labelled 'Protect' will be safeguarded, and development here will need to submit a full planning application for approval – which is no different to the current system. Protect is not about stopping development, but identifying characteristics that are worthy of protecting – similar to a current "Conservation Area" where development is permitted only where it is in harmony with what makes that place special.

Procedurally, plans will be developed much more quickly because some of the hoops that must be jumped through will be removed: Local Plans will no longer be required to be 'sound' or 'deliverable', and local planning authorities will no longer be bound by a duty to cooperate with neighbouring authorities. This is a significant reduction in the procedural aspects of plan-making that should result in time saving.

Section 106 agreements and the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will be replaced with a new infrastructure levy which be a fixed proportion of the value of a new development, above a set threshold, which is envisioned as helping to deliver more affordable housing. It will also fund local projects such as roads, amenity spaces and subsidising a discount for first-time buyers. At the same time there is an expectation that affordable housing will be delivered 'on-site'.

The Government will give Babergh District a housing requirement target instead of Babergh calculating its own. Local planning authorities will then need to set out which land is designated to help meet this requirement. The assumption is that development will largely take place on brownfield land and within existing urban areas, but in Babergh this is unrealistic.

All homes delivered under the new planning system will need to be 'zero-carbon ready', with a requirement that all new homes are carbon neutral by 2050 and that new homes will not require retrofitting.

The reforms are also intended to help Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) access the housing industry, in an effort to improve diversity and competition away from large, well-established housebuilders. The promotion of SMEs and self-builders in the industry is hoped to foster greater innovation, and encourage higher standards.

The use of Modern Methods of Construction (MMC) are encouraged – so house designs are likely to change from the traditional brick and tile, door and three windows, pitched roof appearance.

Consultation next steps

The Government's consultation is in the format of a series of questions published here: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/907647/MHCLG-Planning-Consultation.pdf.

The Town Council Manager has drafted a response for consideration by Planning Advisory Committee, which should be read in conjunction with the consultation material.

The Committee is presented with the draft response today to NOTE. Members may take the papers away to consider, and make recommendations at subsequent Planning Advisory Committee meetings to the Town Council Manager who will amend the response as appropriate. The final submission to the Government will be agreed at the Planning Advisory Committee meeting on 27 October before submission to MCHLG on 29 October.

1. What three words do you associate most with the planning system in England?

Underfunded, misunderstood, unfocused

2. Do you get involved with planning decisions in your local area?

Yes, the Town Council routinely considers planning applications, and is involved in local and national consultations on planning matters in a dedicated Planning Advisory Committee. The Town Council has also started and will shortly revive a Neighbourhood Development Plan.

3. Our proposals will make it much easier to access plans and contribute your views to planning decisions. How would you like to find out about plans and planning proposals in the future?

Directly by email as is the current method

4. What are your top three priorities for planning in your local area?

Building homes for young people / building homes for the homeless

Protection of green spaces

√ **The environment, biodiversity and action on climate change**

Increasing the affordability of housing

The design of new homes and places

√ **Supporting the high street**

Supporting the local economy

√ **More or better local infrastructure**

Protection of existing heritage buildings or areas

Other – please specify

5. Do you agree that Local Plans should be simplified in line with our proposals?

Yes, the Planning Authority should focus on the quality of each land designation (as opposed to focusing on procedure of plan-making). Zoning land alongside a schedule of policies/parameters allows flexibility, innovation and speed. The removal of Soundness/ Duty to Cooperate etc is welcome, but the energy must be put in to ensuring development is quality and attractive. It does appear that Local can take up to 7 years to be adopted and are often out of date by the time they are agreed and often seen as a loop hole by developers

6. Do you agree with our proposals for streamlining the development management content of Local Plans, and setting out general development management policies nationally?

Not sure. Overall in principle the “basic Development Management catch-all policy tests” (such as access & parking, design quality, environmental performance etc) should be nationalised, as long as the LPA is permitted/able to adopt its own policies that add more detail where appropriate in order to avoid a standardised/national environment, without unnecessary repetition of national policy.

Yes. The LPA focusing on the form and appearance of development instead of the process of permitting it is a positive step forward.

7(a). Do you agree with our proposals to replace existing legal and policy tests for Local Plans with a consolidated test of “sustainable development”, which would include consideration of environmental impact?

Not Sure. As a Town Council it is considered important that plans are properly made quickly, rather than years focused on procedural matters that delay adoption. As long as the new tests are streamlined and don't get bogged down in unnecessary process themselves as occurred with SA/SEA. A clear national “checklist” would greatly assist LPAs stay focused on the aspects that are required. It does seem on occasion that housing need projects are ignored when there is no secure land supply.

Yes. Having a preferred site and a suite of reserve sites approach will work as long as the control mechanisms are strong – it would not be desirable to have all sites coming forward – otherwise they would all be “plan A sites” in the first place.

7(b). How could strategic, cross-boundary issues be best planned for in the absence of a formal Duty to Cooperate?

Instead of a Duty to Cooperate whereby consensus MUST be obtained, strategic matters should be addressed through a Statement of Strategic Issues and how they are approached by the LPA – this will INFORM neighbouring bodies of the approach without having to reach an agreed approach. The neighbouring LPA will consider the statement and act on its own approach *with* that knowledge rather than *bound* by it. It is not desirable to have a higher-level plan (Structure Plan) again as this adds unnecessary complication.

8(a). Do you agree that a standard method for establishing housing requirements (that takes into account constraints) should be introduced?

Yes, This will reduce Inquiry time and speed up adoption of plans – it is one of if not the most controversial matters. However, the target MUST be realistically achieved/deliverable and therefore not a simple single process applied to every LPA evenly: It must take in to account local circumstances including historic build rates, local economic factors etc and not put in place a target that is too high to actually deliver. A housing target figure should be stepped: a minimum delivery number, a desirable number, and a bonus number, with appropriate sanctions and rewards. If the minimum number isn't being met then reserve sites are released.

It is wrong that where there is less than 5-year supply that applications are looked on favourably in otherwise unfavourable locations. “Location A” should not be penalised for “Location B” failing to deliver a site/target. This is why reserves sites in any given location are necessary – so there are no surprises for other places when delivery is falling.

The planning system has done its job when a sound plan is made, but the developers then bend rules. Therefore when sites are not coming forward and there are no significant reasons other than the land owner/developer is not bringing the site forward, this should not result in sanctions on the planning system (ie relaxed policies elsewhere), but in sanctions on the land owner/developer.

It must take into account local circumstances including historic build rates, local economic factors etc., and not put in place a target that is too high to actually deliver - this leads to a lack of public trust in the Planning system.

8(b). Do you agree that affordability and the extent of existing urban areas are appropriate indicators of the quantity of development to be accommodated?

Yes, they are important factors alongside the other factors listed to determine the quantity of development.

9(a). Do you agree that there should be automatic outline permission for areas for substantial development (Growth areas) with faster routes for detailed consent?

Yes as long as the terms of the outline consent in terms of the types of uses and some details as to what would be acceptable are clear. For example, a site for “housing” could be better expressed as “up to 100 homes each with 2 parking spaces”. These should be made by the LPA, not centrally.

9(b). Do you agree with our proposals above for the consent arrangements for Renewal and Protected areas?

No. There must also be a mechanism for locally-set policies which is not mentioned in the supporting text.

Clear criteria for what would/not be acceptable in these areas is needed to ensure community support.

9(c). Do you think there is a case for allowing new settlements to be brought forward under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects regime?

No, blending housing and infrastructure regimes undermines the confidence in either, as it may be seen as a back door method of securing development. Sufficient mechanisms already exist to deliver both, so it is not necessary to cross-contaminate them.

10. Do you agree with our proposals to make decision-making faster and more certain?

No, because the speed of decision-making is rarely the reason that homes are not developed. This proposal puts all the “blame” on the LPA for slow decisions, assigns it unrealistic targets and provides sanctions if targets are not met. There is no suggestion of reward for quality (too many sticks and not enough carrots). In many cases it is the applicant that has caused delay through poor quality applications, slow response to requests for more information, non-delivery of permissions etc, but none of these proposals recognise that.

A rushed decision is rarely a quality decision. Further, an LPA will start to refuse more applications if they will run out of time – more workload for PINS and less certainty for the public.

Improved validation requirements would be necessary if decision target dates become deadlines. Much of the delay is caused by the applicant not providing information up-front. If the requirement is reduced as suggested then there will be a significant drop off in approvals.

More technology in the process will have few benefits over current working practices. Applications are already dealt with in a paperless way. The planning system is not a tick-box decision – it is judgement.

The modernisation of decision-making relies entirely on the preparation of the Local Plan and monitoring /upkeep of the data that supports decisions in a front-loaded system. This is wholly at odds with the ambition of simplifying of plan making, and the 30 month adoption target.

If the applicant is eligible for a refund of fee if an appeal is upheld, then the same reward should be available for the LPA if the appeal is dismissed.

11. Do you agree with our proposals for accessible, web-based Local Plans?

Yes, simplified, map-based online plans are the best way to depict the local policies.

12. Do you agree with our proposals for a 30 month statutory timescale for the production of Local Plans?

Partially. The plan-making steps are explicitly detailed in terms of minimum timeframes. However most plans are delayed because of procedural issues. Much of the proposal is very vague, and unless there is clarity over the steps and the level of detail required at each, there is too much scope for delay as developers and objectors look for ways to derail the process due to uncertainty. But it must be realistic, and increasing local consultation is wholly at odds with faster processing time. There needs to be a much simpler, more consistent and predictable examination process rather than time limits. However, a reward for speedy

adoption should be considered, together with sanctions if an LPA cannot get a plan adopted within a certain timeframe.

13(a). Do you agree that Neighbourhood Plans should be retained in the reformed planning system?

Yes. NDPs have the potential to be so powerful. There should be a much simpler mechanism for making NDPs, and more support in terms of template plans and guidance because to date, because of a lack of guidance, most NDPs simply copy or re-phrase the principal plans, and fail to allocate sites, and as such have limited value.

13(b). How can the neighbourhood planning process be developed to meet our objectives, such as in the use of digital tools and reflecting community preferences about design?

Simplification of plan making will greatly assist in boosting local involvement – especially in NDPs. With simpler procedures combined with more guidance/templates, the impact of NDPs can be hugely boosted.

Any digital resources may be expensive and ensuring compatibility with the LPD software may be prohibitive. Communities undertaking NDPs should have direct access to the LPA software capability.

14. Do you agree there should be a stronger emphasis on the build out of developments? And if so, what further measures would you support?

Yes. Ensuring permissions are implemented is more important than just approving more and more applications to replace those not coming forward. It is not appropriate to apply sanctions to the LPA for poor performance without mirroring sanctions for the market when it performs poorly.

Land owners and developers should be subject to sanctions that take in to account many factors around non-delivery such as availability of labour and materials, economic conditions etc. as long as overall those not bringing sites forward are made to do so. Sanctions can be stepped, including financial penalties and ultimately in the site ownership being transferred to the Local Authority to bring forward.

15. What do you think about the design of new development that has happened recently in your area?

Aesthetically, new designs are “anywhere houses” and do not reflect our local heritage. Layouts maximise plot numbers but result in poor urban environments and fragmented streets. The basic principles in the Urban Design Compendium by English partnerships in 2000 (UDC) around corner treatment, entrances and nodes etc are not implemented and the results are weak.

House designs are standardised, bland and old fashioned. It would be nice to see more variety including some modern designs – especially in new estates where there is no neighbouring style to seek to copy. More variety is welcome. Standardised and old fashioned can be appropriate, but there is no development that balances it by being wild, daring and imaginative. There is scope for all.

“Beauty” is too bland a term to describe- the UDC sets out what “good design” means - a mix of visually attractive and operationally efficient.

16. Sustainability is at the heart of our proposals. What is your priority for sustainability in your area?

Less reliance on cars

- More green and open spaces
- Energy efficiency of new buildings
- More trees
- √ Other

All sustainability issues are important and need to be applied in the specific circumstances. It cannot be said that energy efficiency can be ranked against the need for open space. Both are important. The Urban Design Compendium balances these factors.

17. Do you agree with our proposals for improving the production and use of design guides and codes?

A cautious yes, depending on how detailed they are and how well they are enforced.

18. Do you agree that we should establish a new body to support design coding and building better places, and that each authority should have a chief officer for design and place-making?

Yes, with appropriate funding and powers. CABE, English Partnerships have already existed – why not use these established bodies.

19. Do you agree with our proposal to consider how design might be given greater emphasis in the strategic objectives for Homes England?

Yes, design quality is an important factor for Homes England to consider.

20. Do you agree with our proposals for implementing a fast-track for beauty?

No. At local level the codes will work, but at national level “beauty” cannot be defined, and what works in one place does not work in another. Local circumstance is key to understanding beauty – which means there can be no fast track option.

The pattern book of designs that this country has seen was the result of economies of scale, not borne out of good design. Standardising the country is not the way to achieve quality places. The national volume house builders’ portfolios of standard designs are damaging to local character, not supportive of it.

21. When new development happens in your area, what is your priority for what comes with it?

- More affordable housing
- More or better infrastructure (such as transport, schools, health provision)
- Design of new buildings
 - More shops and/or employment space
- Green space
- √ Other

All are important factors – none trumps another.

22(a). Should the Government replace the Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 planning obligations with a new consolidated Infrastructure Levy, which is charged as a fixed proportion of development value above a set threshold?

Yes a single regime is simpler.

22(b). Should the Infrastructure Levy rates be set nationally at a single rate, set nationally at an area-specific rate, or set locally?

The Levy should be calculated at the finest grain possible to allow for local circumstances. However there should be a national minimum rate as safety net.

Locations with a Neighbourhood Plan should continue to receive a %age of the IL income.

22(c). Should the Infrastructure Levy aim to capture the same amount of value overall, or more value, to support greater investment in infrastructure, affordable housing and local communities?

More value should be captured where there is a larger deficit in the Infrastructure delivery Plan needs.

22(d). Should we allow local authorities to borrow against the Infrastructure Levy, to support infrastructure delivery in their area?

Yes. This will allow infrastructure to be delivered up-front without damaging cash-flow for the developer.

23. Do you agree that the scope of the reformed Infrastructure Levy should capture changes of use through permitted development rights?

Yes, there is still an uplift in value from such development that should contribute.

24(a). Do you agree that we should aim to secure at least the same amount of affordable housing under the Infrastructure Levy, and as much on-site affordable provision, as at present?

Partly. There is a quantity aspect to AH, and a location aspect. Some sites are unsuitable for AH, so a mechanism for off-site provision should be made including availability of land and funds to develop Local Authority housing/ housing association.

24(b). Should affordable housing be secured as in-kind payment towards the Infrastructure Levy, or as a 'right to purchase' at discounted rates for local authorities?

There should be a number of options available to allow the developer and Local Authority to be flexible towards local circumstances.

24(c). If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, should we mitigate against local authority overpayment risk?

The LPA should be a facilitator to assist risk management during development when cashflow is problematic, but should not be put at risk overall at the end of the project. There should be many options available for flexibility, none of which result in the Local Authority losing out overall.

24(d). If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, are there additional steps that would need to be taken to support affordable housing quality?

Other mechanisms exist to ensure quality (eg Building Regs).

25. Should local authorities have fewer restrictions over how they spend the Infrastructure Levy?

No, the money is raised for infrastructure and should not be used as a cash-cow for other initiatives. The money raised is already low compared with infrastructure costs overall.

25(a). If yes, should an affordable housing 'ring-fence' be developed?

Yes, but there is a greater need for infrastructure so the ring should not be too large. ALL development needs infrastructure, but only some need AH.

26. Do you have any views on the potential impact of the proposals raised in this consultation on people with protected characteristics as defined in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010?

No.