

SA/01/15

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE B** held at the Council Offices, Needham Market on 23 December 2014

PRESENT: Councillor Kathie Guthrie – Conservative and Independent Group (Chairman)

Conservative and Independent Group

Councillor: Caroline Byles
Stuart Gemmill
Derrick Haley *

Suffolk Together, Green and Independent Group

Councillor: Gerard Brewster
John Matthissen

Liberal Democrat Group

Councillor: John Field
Michael Norris

Ward Member: Andrew Stringer

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

SA19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE/SUBSTITUTIONS

Councillor Derrick Haley was substituting for Councillor Roy Barker. An apology for absence was received from Councillor Poppy Robinson.

SA20 DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY/NON-PECUNIARY INTEREST

Councillor Gerard Brewster declared a non-pecuniary interest in application 1662/14 as a member of the Stowmarket Town Council Planning Committee, and application 1835/14 as the applicant was known to him.

SA21 DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING

There were no declarations of lobbying.

SA22 DECLARATIONS OF PERSONAL SITE VISITS

There were no declarations of personal site visits.

SA23 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD 22 OCTOBER 2014

The minutes of the meeting held 22 October 2014 were confirmed as a correct record.

SA24 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Application Number	Representations from
1662/14	Philip Cobbold (Agent)
1835/14	Philip Cobbold (Agent)
1743/14	Karen Sanders (Applicant)

Item1

Application	1662/14
Proposal	Erection of residential development consisting of 27 two bed flats (including 4 affordable units), fifty-four allocated car parking spaces and five visitor spaces. Associated refuse and cycle stores (as amended by plans 24/07/14).
Site Location	STOWMARKET – Land adjoining roundabout, Bury Road.
Applicant	Laurence Homes (Eastern) Ltd

Philip Cobbold, Agent, advised that the site already had planning permission for a three storey office development which had been implemented. He said that although it was outside the Settlement Boundary it was not an area of countryside and had better connectability to the town than some greenfield sites already granted permission for development. He believed the loss of the site was outweighed by the benefits to the town by the provision of low cost affordable housing. There were no objections from consultees.

Councillor Gary Green, Ward Member, commenting by email said that he felt the design of the building was plain and disappointing for a gateway entrance to Stowmarket. The access from the A1308 was on a busy section of road and he believed this exit and entrance to the site should be left turn only with the entrance from Chilton Way used as the main entrance. There should be no parking for 15m either side of the Chilton Way entrance with the legal order paid for by the developer. Consideration should be given to the installation of a sprinkler system throughout the building. Stowmarket was currently lacking in infrastructure, especially sports provision, and he supported the proposed Section 106 provisions. He said he was not against the development of the site but had reservations as detailed.

Members generally supported the application. The site already had planning permission and it was felt the current proposal was an improvement in many areas. The two bed affordable housing was needed and the design fitted in locally. There was some concern regarding the access onto an already busy road, and also cycling and pedestrian access to the town but it was considered that looking at the application as a whole this was acceptable. Concern was expressed regarding noise from the A14 and a motion for approval subject to an amendment to the noise condition to meet the recommendations from Environmental Health was proposed and seconded.

Officers were also requested to include an informative to the decision notice recommending inclusion of sprinklers for fire safety and open broadband.

By 6 votes to 3

Decision – That authority be delegated to the Corporate Manager – Development Management to grant Planning Permission subject to prior completion of a Section 106 Planning Obligation to his satisfaction for:

- [a] Contribution to Open Space and Social Infrastructure policy
- [b] Provision of 4 on site affordable homes
- [c] Contribution for education provision

and that the planning permission be subject to conditions including:

- Standard time limit
- Approved Plans
- Conditions on surface and foul water drainage and management
- Landscaping plan to be implemented as submitted
- Landscape management plan
- Tree protection
- Lighting scheme
- Boundary treatment
- Sound mitigation measures to be agreed as recommended by Environmental Health Officer
- Rainwater harvesting and sustainable design measure
- Fire hydrants
- Archeological brief
- Highways conditions
- Construction management plan

Add informative notes: [a] recommending inclusion of sprinklers for fire safety and [b] recommending inclusion of open broadband

Item 2

Application	1835/14
Proposal	Erection of two-storey detached dwelling
Site Location	MENDLESHAM – Land adjacent 2 Riverside Cottage, Mendlesham Green
Applicant	Mr and Mrs C Huntingford

Philip Cobbold, Agent, said that just because a site was no longer in a Settlement Boundary it did not mean it was unsustainable. The site was not isolated, it was an established group of dwellings and development would help support services in Mendlesham village. Since the introduction of the NPPF many appeals had been allowed on sites outside a Settlement Boundary. He felt the design reflected local distinctiveness and was not out of scale with its surroundings.

Councillor Andrew Stringer, Ward Member, advised that the Parish Council had supported the principle of development for the previous application but the design had been too dominant. However, the Settlement Boundary had now been removed, the site was isolated from the village and to suggest that people would walk or cycle to local services was ridiculous. The road was narrow with no footpath and unsafe to walk along. There was inadequate on site parking and it would not be possible for a car to turn round and exit in forward gear. The application was unsustainable.

Members fully supported the Officer's reasons for refusal and a motion to approve the recommendation was proposed and seconded.

By a unanimous vote

Decision – That Full Planning Permission be refused for the following reasons:

1. The dwelling as proposed would be an unjustified and non-sustainable development within the countryside it is, furthermore unacceptable by reason of its design and bulk in proximity to the boundary with the neighbouring property Crickhollow and would have a dominant and unacceptable effect upon the normal residential amenities of occupiers of that property. New dwellings in the countryside will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that there are overriding needs which justify an exception being made to safeguard local distinctiveness and be inconsistent in scale and form with its surroundings. On that basis the development would be contrary to Saved Local Plan Policies GP1, H7, H13, H15 and H16 (1998), Policies CS1, CS2 and CS5 of the Adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy (2008), Policies FC1 and FC1.1 of the Adopted Core Strategy Focussed Review (2012). The development would also be contrary to the objectives of the NPPF (Paragraphs 17, 55, 56 and 60).
2. The proposal fails to provide adequate on site parking and as such would be prejudicial to highway safety in the locality. As such the proposal is contrary to saved Policy T9 and T10 of the Mid Suffolk Local Plan (1998).

Item 3

Application	1743/14
Proposal	Retention of change of use of land for the temporary siting of a mobile home.
Site Location	MENDLESHAM – The Stackyard Nursery, Old Station Road
Applicant	Mr S Sanders

Karen Sanders, the applicant, said that when the business was started she had thought it possible to have livestock on the site while living elsewhere. However, she had found that to provide appropriate animal welfare it was necessary to be on site at all times and all animals had been removed. As the income from the animals represented 30% of the business this meant it was no longer viable. Also, when the coffee shop, building on which had started, was open a condition of the planning permission was that 70% of the income must be from the business' own animals, fruit etc. It was therefore critical to live on site and she asked that permission be given for the application. An ACORUS report had been provided as evidence of need.

Councillor Andrew Stringer, Ward Member, said that when the business was first proposed there had been both parish council and local support. However, as time had passed questions were raised as to when the coffee shop was to open. The business was a mix of horticulture and agriculture and only the agriculture side could require a residence on site. He acknowledged the ACORUS report but felt it would be more relevant if animals were still on site. If it was critical to the enterprise for animals to be kept, the applicant could have retained them and if the application was refused then go through the appeal process. Although sympathetic to the applicant he was unable to

support the application as he did not believe the agricultural element supported the need to live on site.

Clarification was requested on the details of the conditions to the previous approval and following a short adjournment these were provided. Opinion was divided but although Members had sympathy with the applicant it was generally considered that on balance the need for accommodation on site had not been proved. A motion for refusal as per the recommendation was proposed and seconded.

By 6 votes to 3

Decision – That Full Planning Permission be refused for the following reason:

The proposed development, would, if permitted, be contrary to development plan policies and National Planning Policy Framework, which seek to protect and preserve landscape quality and character of the countryside for its own sake, by restricting development in the countryside to that which is essential to the efficient operation of agriculture, forestry and appropriate recreation and to direct new housing development to within settlement boundaries. The application fails to demonstrate that the needs of the existing agricultural unit justify the provision of residential accommodation on the site and also fails to justify why emergency responses could not be achieved by other means, including alerting and attendance from a more sustainable location, or other working arrangements. On this basis, it is considered that the application is one of personal preference rather than existing needs of the agricultural unit. The proposal is therefore contrary to advice contained within the National Planning Policy Framework together with Policies H7 (restricting housing development unrelated to the needs of the countryside) and H10 (Dwellings for key agricultural workers) of the Mid Suffolk Local Plan (1998), Policies CS1 (Settlement Hierarchy), CS2 (Development in the Countryside and Countryside Villages) and CS5 (Mid Suffolk's Environment) of the Mid Suffolk DPD Core Strategy (2008) and policies FC1 and FC1.1 of the Adopted Core Strategy Focussed Review (2012).