

**Minutes of Sutton Parish Council Meeting Planning Committee**

Held on 9<sup>th</sup> December 2025 ~ 7.00pm

At Sutton Memorial Hall, Old Post Office Lane, Sutton

Present

a) Cllr. Jacki Schafer (Chair), Cllr. Sue Collins, Cllr. Ingrid Franks, Cllr. David Gunson, Cllr. Mary-Jane King and Cllr. Linda Gunson.

Clare Cooper (Clerk) Five Members of the Public

*The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting*

**Record of Public Session:**

a) Reports or comment from any member of the public or any other village organisation (notes only):

Residents of Old Post Office Lane attended to make their views known regarding the planning application to be discussed. The following comments were made:

- The proposed houses will affect access for the resident of Fen Hall and the Right of Way which runs along the drive.
- Old Post Office Lane is extremely narrow at the point where access is to the site. Large vehicles will struggle to make the turn into and out of the access.
- In place the lane is single track and when two vehicles meet they cannot pass without pulling into resident's driveways.
- An increase in traffic along Old Post Office Lane will make it more dangerous for children walking to and from the school bus.
- The area of land to be developed seems to be large for only three houses. Are the number of houses likely to be increased once Outline Planning Permission has been granted?
- The landowner owns more land around this site. Previously planning was sought for 47 homes. Will the area be increased and future applications made for more housing?
- Two of the cottages on Old Post Office Lane currently have vehicular access to the rear of their properties which will be lost if the planned housing goes ahead. The occupants have no other access for vehicles and would be unable to park them on Old Post Office Lane due to the width of the road.
- The Memorial Hall now has many more vehicles accessing the car park which at times is full. Overflow vehicles park along Old Post Office Lane making access to the carpark and homes more difficult. More houses and traffic will only make this worse.
- The play equipment at the Memorial Hall has been upgraded meaning more children are walking along and crossing Old Post Office Lane.
- The notices issued by Planning had the wrong location leading to confusion as to where the development is taking place.

---

*Chair's initials.....*

Agenda Item	Resolution / Agreement / Fact	Action
<p>1. <u>Apologies for Absence</u></p> <p>a) To receive apologies</p> <p>b) To approve apologies</p>	<p>a) Apologies were received from two local residents.</p> <p>b) The apologies were accepted.</p>	<p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) None</p>
<p>2. <u>To receive any</u></p> <p>a) Declarations of Pecuniary Interest</p> <p>b) Declarations of Non-Pecuniary Interest</p> <p>c) Applications for Dispensation on Agenda Items</p> <p>d) Declarations of Gifts or Hospitality received over the value of £50.00</p> <p>e) Notifications of Lobbying with reference to any Planning Application to be discussed</p>	<p>a) None</p> <p>b) None</p> <p>c) None</p> <p>d) None</p> <p>e) Cllrs. Schafer, Collins and Gunson had been spoken to by local residents opposed to the Planning Application</p>	<p>a) None</p> <p>b) None</p> <p>c) None</p> <p>d) None</p> <p>e) Noted</p>
<p>3. <u>Public Session</u></p> <p>a) Members of the public</p>	<p>a) See above</p>	<p>Noted</p>

Chair's initials.....

Agenda Item	Resolution / Agreement / Fact	Action
<p>4. <u>Planning Application</u></p> <p>a) DC/25/4363/OUT - Outline Application - Erection of up to 3 no. dwellings - Land Rear Of, 7 - 14 Woodbridge Road, Sutton, Suffolk</p>	<p>a) The Planning Committee had made a site visit and come to the following conclusions:</p> <p>Background:</p> <p>Sutton is a village in the Suffolk Coasts and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It is the largest parish in Suffolk and is bordered by the River Deben, Rendlesham Forest and the Sutton Hoo Estate, the latter being the site of the world-famous Anglo-Saxon Ship. It is an area full of historic and scientific interest. There are a number of statutory designated sites within 2km of the proposed development. These include: Crag Pit, Sutton (SSSI), Deben Estuary (RAMSAR, SPA, SSSI), Rockhall Wood Pit, Sutton (SSSI), Sutton and Hollesley Heaths (SSSI), Sandlings (SPA). 2 County Wildlife Sites within 2km – Shottisham Creek (CWS) and Shottisham Heath. For an area with such a wealth of natural resources, we must ensure that these assets are protected for future generations.</p> <p>1. The planning application by the Applicant prepared by Wilkinson Planning concerns land to the rear of Old Post Office Lane. The land in question is of shrub/bramble, tussocky grassland and a cherry tree, all of which will be removed should the application succeed. However, this land supports Muntjac deer, nesting birds during the summer season, nightingales which regularly visit, adders, badgers and a colony of bats which are in the vicinity, and of which are a protected species. If this application succeeds this will cause a great deal of disturbance to the wildlife. The Biodiversity Net Gain Baseline Report, prepared by Abrehart Ecology, recognises that no enhancement in biodiversity will be achieved “due to the complete re-development of the site in its entirety” which possibly indicates that more than three houses will ultimately be the aim (see comments in paragraph 7)</p>	<p>Clerk to upload comment to Planning Portal</p>

Agenda Item	Resolution / Agreement / Fact	Action
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="757 272 1671 341">2. We believe the proposed development of the three houses is “infill” and behind the building line.</li> <li data-bbox="757 389 1749 651">3. Access to the proposed development is via a right of way footpath shared by Fen Hall, a property built before 1900, and is undeveloped and a single track. This is frequently used by walkers and residents. The development would obstruct a long-established access route and parking ability that has been used openly and continuously for decades, creating a prescriptive right of way. Blocking it would remove a legally recognised access essential to the functioning of properties on Old Post Office Lane.</li> <li data-bbox="757 699 1738 922">4. Residents in Old Post Office Lane bordering the proposed development currently use the track to access parking behind their properties. The current proposal does not recognise this and does not propose a solution. Should the Applicant deny these residents access, they have no provision in front of their properties, to park vehicles as Old Post Office Lane is totally unsuitable for parking.</li> <li data-bbox="757 970 1760 1118">5. No proposal has been submitted in the application regarding the intended sewage arrangements. It is also noted that no provision for garaging of vehicles is made. Doubts exist over the provision of parking for visitors to the proposed properties.</li> <li data-bbox="757 1166 1760 1385">6. Currently, recent developments in Old Post Office Lane created a wider roadway with a footpath. This finishes before the bungalow known as Redlands, where Old Post Office Lane is significantly reduced to a width of 2.7 metres. The Applicant proposes to widen the turning into the right of way track, but makes no proposal as to the insufficient width of Old Post Office Lane, for an increase in vehicles and HGV movements whilst construction of the</li> </ol>	

Agenda Item	Resolution / Agreement / Fact	Action
	<p>proposed three properties takes place. This also highlights increased dangers to walkers and school children who frequently use the lane to and from the school bus stop on Woodbridge Road. The visibility splay of 36m needs to be checked, as due to the bend of the road, we feel that this would not be possible.</p> <p>7. It is contended that the application is in an area governed by AONB but now rebranded as National Landscapes. It is also noted that the Applicant has previously submitted a proposal for 47 houses on this site, which was subsequently advised as being unacceptable. It is contended that this planning application for three houses will be followed by a much larger development, should the three houses be granted. Is there a need for these houses? The houses that have been put up for sale in the village have been slow to sell, or have been removed from sale due to lack of interest.</p> <p>8. A number of errors exist within the Wilkinson Planning Report. Sutton has no school, no shop, no public transport, other than a dedicated school bus, no GP surgery, and no post office, all of which the Report suggests that the village has as facilities. Slow broadband and a very poor mobile signal are also experienced. Along with other villages on the peninsula, Sutton suffers severely with transport congestion at Wilford Bridge and Melton Railway Crossing, which are beyond transport saturation. Any proposed new development must take the overall impact into account, which will only increase.</p> <p>9. We were also surprised by the comment about no listed buildings being near the vicinity of the site. The area is dense with historically significant buildings including: Wood Hall Manor (Grade II listed), Woodhall Lodge (non-designated heritage asset and sits in the curtilage of Wood Hall), Michaelmas Cottage (non-designated heritage asset), Sutton Hall (Grade II listed), Hare House (non-</p>	

Agenda Item	Resolution / Agreement / Fact	Action
<p>b) Any other Planning Application forthcoming</p>	<p>designated heritage asset), All Saints Church, Sutton (Grade I listed). As well as Sutton Hoo, which features on the National Heritage List for England.</p> <p>Although Sutton Parish Council objects to the application in the strongest possible terms, if the development were to be granted, we would request the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Continued and uninterrupted access to the residential properties access for parking behind the properties in Old Post Office Lane</li> <li>b) Regular maintenance and proper upkeep of the lane</li> <li>c) No outdoor lighting including security lighting, as this would be obtrusive to neighbouring properties</li> <li>d) Maintained and uninterrupted access to footpath 11.</li> <li>e) A caveat to request that these will not be holiday homes and will be for the use as homes which will benefit the community.</li> <li>f) A guarantee that this will not be continuously developed into a housing estate as previously requested.</li> </ul> <p>b) None</p>	

The meeting was closed at 7.45pm

Signed: .....  
Chair

Date: .....

*Clare Cooper*  
Clerk to Sutton Parish Council

Chair's initials.....