

**MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Minutes of the **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE 'A'** held at the Council Offices, Needham Market on Wednesday 12 August at 9:30am.

**PRESENT:** Councillors: Matthew Hicks (Chairman)  
Gerard Brewster  
David Burn  
John Field  
Julie Flatman \*  
Lavinia Hadingham  
Diana Kearsley  
Sarah Mansel  
Lesley Mayes  
David Whybrow

Denotes substitute \*

**Ward Members:** Councillor: Derek Osborne  
Kevin Welsby

**In attendance:** Corporate Manager – Development Management  
Senior Development Management Planning Officer (IW)  
Senior Development Management Planning Officer (JPG)  
Senior Development Management Planning Officer (GW)  
Governance Support Officer (VL)

**NA09 APOLOGIES/SUBSTITUTIONS**

Councillor Julie Flatman was substituting for Councillor John Levantis.

**NA10 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillors Lesley Mayes and Gerard Brewster declared a non-pecuniary interest in application 0885/15 as Members of Stowmarket Town Council.

**NA11 DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING**

It was noted that all Members had ben lobbied on application 0210/15.

**NA12 DECLARATIONS OF PERSONAL SITE VISITS**

There were no declarations of personal site visits.

**NA13 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD 15 JULY 2015**

**Report NA/15/15**

The minutes of the meeting held 15 July 2015 were confirmed as a correct record.

## NA14 PETITIONS

None received.

## NA15 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS

None received.

## NA16 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

### Report NA/16/15

In accordance with the Council's procedure for public speaking on planning applications representations were made as detailed below:

<u>Planning Application Number</u>	<u>Representations from</u>
0885/15	Jonathan Best (Agent)
0210/15	Karen Peters (Parish Council) Kim Coe (Objector) Kevin White (Architect)
1506/15	William Buchanan (Applicant)
1309/14	Phil Cobbold (Agent)

### Item 1

Application Number:	<b>0885/15</b>
Proposal:	Redevelopment for a retail store within Class A1, a sui generis builder's merchants with open storage, an extension to the existing access road, access, parking, servicing and landscaping
Site Location:	<b>STOWMARKET</b> – Land at Suffolk Works Site (former Bosch land), Gipping Way
Applicant:	Travis Perkins (Properties) Ltd

Members noted the additional conditions proposed by the Planning Officer and also the Corporate Manager (Environmental Protection) in the tabled papers.

Jonathan Best, the agent, said the proposed location was an accessible, brownfield site adjacent to Bosch and Morrisons and close to the town centre. The proposal, which would create 35 new jobs, would serve both local tradesmen and shoppers. The layout had been amended to increase the depth of the landscaping to ensure the buildings were sufficiently screened. The design was for contemporary warehousing, a height condition had been agreed and the submitted noise report showed how the site could operate without causing problems.

Councillors Gary Green, Barry Humphreys and Dave Muller, the Ward Members commenting by email, said that they were all in favour of the application.

Members considered the proposal was appropriate development for the area and was supported by the NPPF, SAAP and local policies. There would also be an economic benefit to the area. A motion for approval, subject to all the proposed additional conditions, was proposed and seconded.

By 9 votes to 0 with 1 abstention

**Decision** – That Full Planning Permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

- Three year time limit
- Compliance with plan
- Highways conditions
- Contamination conditions
- Surface water drainage conditions
- Hours of use conditions
- Height of external storage condition
- Details of external lighting condition
- Details of advertisement at the site
- Details of landscape and landscape management scheme
- Details of materials to be agreed
- Use of A1 unit to be non-food bulky goods
- Hours of operation: A1 unit: Mon – Sat 07:00-20:00, Sundays and Public Holidays 10:00-16:00
- Hours of operation – sui generis builders merchant: Mon – Fri 07:30-17:00 Saturdays 07:30-12:00. No Sunday or public holiday opening
- Remove mezzanine floor space permitted development rights
- No delivery vehicles to arrive or depart the site before 07:00 hours or after 23:00 hours
- HGVs parked in the Travis Perkins ‘HGV parking’ area shall switch their engines off whilst parked
- All fork lift trucks shall be fitted with low volume, broadband, white noise reversing alarms and flashing lights. The use of horns to be prohibited except for emergency situations
- Banksmen shall be used to guide HGVs into the docking bays and parking areas (reversing alarms shall be switched off)
- The fencing shown on the Plan No 12902-120, dated 07.05.15, shall be ‘acoustic grade’, minimum density 12.5kg/m<sup>3</sup> and be free from gaps. The fencing shall be maintained throughout the life of the development (subject to any amending applications)
- Condition to ensure all plant and machinery installed at the site shall not produce Rating Noise levels higher than the existing background level at the nearest existing or proposed residential receptors (based on the methodology in British Standard 4142:2014)
- No floodlighting or other means of external lighting (with the exception of any illuminated advertisements which may be granted advertising consent) shall be installed at the site except in accordance with details (to include position, height, aiming points, lighting levels and a polar luminance diagram (based on the vertical plane at the nearest existing or proposed residential receptors), which shall have previously been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority

Item 2

Application Number: **0210/15**  
Proposal: Erection of 10 no 2-bed semi-detached 2 storey affordable houses, 9 no 2-bed detached and semi-detached affordable bungalows, 4 no 1-bed affordable

flats, construction of new vehicular access roads, new public open space and erection of 21 garden sheds  
Site Location: **GREAT BLAKENHAM** – Land off Kingfisher Drive  
Applicant: Ms Cook

Karen Peters, speaking for the Parish Council, advised that in view of the large number of local objections received the Parish Council had re-discussed the proposals and had voted unanimously to object to the application. Feelings in the community were so strong that an Action Group had been formed and a petition set up. Mid Suffolk had said the properties would be offered to those with a strong local connection but it was believed that this was not possible with Council owned homes. The properties would be for families but the local school, doctor's surgery and shop were some distance away and not within walking distance making occupants reliant on either cars or public transport. Further concerns were the noise to neighbours when building on the heavy chalk which covered the site, overlooking to neighbours, the steep hill accessing the site which was never gritted in bad weather and the lack of a pedestrian crossing. The application would not work in this location as Great Blakenham needed new supporting facilities to make it a safe place to live.

Kim Coe, an objector, said residents had great concerns regarding the lack of infrastructure in the village and strongly objected to the proposal. Other developments had increased properties by 83% and no additional facilities had been provided. The Energy from Waste site had also increased traffic considerably. The neighbouring properties were mostly occupied by elderly people who had moved to the village for peace and quiet and there was no objection to retirement bungalows on the site. If this proposal was approved the existing homes would be overlooked. It would be unfair to house families on the site as there was no school, shop or doctor's surgery within walking distance and no buses after 6pm. Local feeling was very strong and an Action Group had been formed. A petition had also been raised which had been presented to the local MP. She asked that the proposal be sent back for further discussion and a compromise to be reached.

Kevin White, the architect, said the need for affordable housing in Great Blakenham had been assessed and this had identified the need for smaller sized accommodation, both for single people and older couples wishing to downsize. The proposed two accesses would prevent vehicular through traffic and the two parking places would prevent on-street parking. Single storey dwellings were proposed on the higher ground to prevent overlooking and the generous planting would give character to the street scene. Extensive consultation with residents had been undertaken and the concerns collated resulting in a significant number of design changes. The zebra crossing would improve pedestrian safety for all residents. The dwellings would provide much needed affordable housing with priority being given to those with a local connection.

Councillor John Field, Ward Member, advised that his initial view was that there was a major shortage of affordable housing and this development would go some way towards addressing this. However, Great Blakenham had already suffered dramatic increases in housing and industrial development and lacked the infrastructure to cope. It could be assumed from the objections from almost all residents of neighbouring developments were based on NIMBY views and prejudice but he did not believe that was the case. He believed local people had a

clear and realistic view of the likely outcome of the proposal. The density was high with no market contribution, two bedroom properties dominated with a focus on two storey designs when expectation had been for a development of bungalows. Car parking had been designed not to dominate the environment but the proposed tandem parking was likely to result in on pavement parking adversely impacting on the amenity of existing dwellings. There was concern regarding the potential impact on social cohesion of an all affordable development. The issue of overlooking was proposed to be addressed with fencing but it was difficult to be sure that on such a steeply sloping site this would be successful. In conclusion, he felt that although much work had been put into development and improvement of a concept with basic flaws, there could be a better solution and urged that the application be returned so that the issues residents clearly understood could be addressed.

Councillor Kevin Welsby, Ward Member, said that although there were a large number of objections to the application there was a pressing need for social housing. The proposal would provide high quality homes built to lifetime homes standard. Having reviewed the new draft Tenancy Agreement he believed it was tough and fair and would ensure that tenants were suitable. Although the land was important locally for dog walking there was space on the other side of Stowmarket Road and the zebra crossing would make this safely accessible. There was a great lack of facilities which had led to a disparate community and he urged investment in amenities and community building if the application was approved. He supported the application.

The Committee considered the application at length and requested clarification on various matters from Officers. Whilst understanding residents' concerns regarding the recent rapid growth in the area in comparison to local infrastructure it was generally felt that the application was acceptable. The site was within the Settlement Boundary, the layout was satisfactory, there were no objections from the Highways Authority and the Section 106 monies would address some of the infrastructure issues. Planning policies supported the development.

A motion to approve the application, subject to an additional condition requiring a considerate contractor scheme to be agreed, and an amendment to the landscaping condition that there be no development above slab level prior to the perimeter landscaping being agreed, was proposed and seconded.

By 8 votes to 1

**Decision** – That Full Planning Permission be granted subject to:

1) The prior completion of a Section 106 agreement to secure the following heads of terms:

- Affordable housing
- Zebra crossing £50,000
- Education contribution £73,086
- Open Space and Social Infrastructure £97,475
- Provision and management of on-site public open space
- Legal and Monitoring costs

2) The following conditions:

- Standards time limit
- Approved plans
- Levels
- Archaeological Scheme of Investigation and assessment
- Waste minimisation and recycling strategy to be agreed
- Sustainable drainage scheme to be agreed
- Scheme for fire hydrants to be agreed
- Carrying capacity for hard standing for pumping/high reach appliances of 15/26 tonnes
- Erection of fencing prior to first occupation and subsequent retention
- Obscure glaze windows in north elevation of Block A
- Obscure glaze first floor windows in south elevations of Block J, K and L
- Remove Permitted Development Rights Part 1 Class A to E (extensions, roof extensions/alterations, porches and outbuildings) and Part 2 Class A (gates, fences, walls)
- Ecology mitigation and enhancement measures
- Materials details
- No development above slab level without perimeter structural landscaping scheme and timetable to be agreed, to be delivered in a timely manner before the units are first occupied
- Considerate contractor scheme to be agreed

### Item 3

Application Number: **1506/15**  
 Proposal: Demolition of existing duck rearing buildings and erection of cold store building. Installation of solar panels on cold store building  
 Site Location: **REDGRAVE** – Part of Gressingham Foods Ltd, Hinderclay Road  
 Applicant: Gressingham Foods

It was noted that an additional condition, 'No means of external lighting except as agreed by the local planning authority', was proposed.

William Buchanan, the applicant, said the report set out the relevant policy, landscape assessment and economic considerations. He outlined the reasons the cold store was needed and the public and business benefits of the proposal. If approved it would allow the business to operate more efficiently and to be more sustainable. There would be a significant reduction in lorry movements lessening the impact on the surrounding villages and roads.

Members agreed the proposal was satisfactory subject to the inclusion of the proposed additional condition.

By a unanimous vote

**Decision** – Subject to no adverse response from Suffolk Land Drainage, that Full Planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

- Standard time limit
- List of approved documents

- Landscape scheme to be agreed
- Landscape maintenance/replanting for a ten year period
- Full details, including colours, of external materials to be agreed
- A minimum of 10% of energy consumed to be derived from on-site renewables to be agreed prior to use of building
- Surface water drainage details to be approved before building is first used
- No means of external lighting except as agreed in writing by the local planning authority

Item 4

Application Number: **1309/14**  
 Proposal: Erection of a single storey dwelling  
 Site Location: **TOSTOCK** – Meadow House, Flatts Lane  
 Applicant: Mr and Mrs Spreadbury and Martin Hutton

Members were advised that an additional condition requiring tree protection fencing during construction was proposed.

It was noted that the plans shown on pages 150, 151, 154 and 155 of the report related to the previous application and should be ignored. It was further noted that since the recent appeal decision (copied within the report) the Highways Authority had indicated that it would now approve one additional dwelling within the Settlement Boundary, and that there was also now a passing place on Flatts Lane.

Phil Cobbold, the agent, said the site was within the Settlement Boundary and the principle of development was accepted. The Parish Council had originally expressed concerns regarding the height and scale of the proposed dwelling and also highway safety. The revised design for a single storey dwelling resolved the height/scale issue and was of a high quality design which complemented the character of the area. The Inspector in making his decision in relation to an application further along Flatts Lane which proposed a change of use to an annexe and holiday let, had disagreed with the decision to refuse on highway grounds and concluded that the proposal would not be prejudicial to highway safety. When the two dwellings were built on the adjacent land the access had been enlarged to accommodate a passing bay which had not been implemented when the previous application for this site was considered. The proposal would not cause harm to residential amenity or highway safety.

Councillor Sarah Mansel, Ward Member, advised that this had been a long drawn out issue. The first application for a two storey dwelling had resulted in many objections and the situation had been exacerbated by the decision relating to the barn further down Flatts Lane and subsequent appeal decision, and also the breach of planning conditions as the site was used as a builder's yard. It had always been known there was a third plot for development and many would be pleased that the site was to be tidied up. Although the Inspector had stated that vehicles could use the western branch of Flatts Lane to access the road she did not believe anyone did so. However, she considered on balance that the proposal was a reasonable compromise for the site but felt it should be the final development on Flatts Lane.

Members considered the application to be acceptable. The site was within the Settlement Boundary and the design addressed most of the previous objections and would not impact on the Visually Important Open Space. There would be no

loss of residential amenity and the builder's yard would be tidied up. It was felt that Flatts Lane was no different to many other small roads in the area and the minimal additional traffic could be accommodated with no adverse impact on highway safety.

By a unanimous vote

**Decision** – That Full Planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

- Standard time condition
- Approved plans
- Construction management condition
- Parking and turning to be secured
- Materials to be agreed
- Tree protection fencing during construction