

SA/03/15

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE B** held at the Council Offices, Needham Market on 18 February 2015

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

Conservative and Independent Group

Councillor: Roy Barker
Caroline Byles
Stuart Gemmill
Derrick Haley *
Jane Storey

Suffolk Together, Green and Independent Group

Councillor: Gerard Brewster
John Matthissen

Liberal Democrat Group

Councillor: John Field
Michael Norris

Ward Member: David Burn
Lesley Mayes

Denotes substitute: *

In attendance: Corporate Manager – Development Management
Senior Development Management Planning Officer (IW)
Planning Officer (SB)
Senior Environmental Protection Officer (PS)
Governance Support Officer (VL)

SA25 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE/SUBSTITUTIONS

Councillor Derrick Haley was substituting for Councillor Poppy Robinson.

SA26 DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY/NON-PECUNIARY INTEREST

Councillors Roy Barker, Caroline Byles, John Field, Stuart Gemmill, Kathie Guthrie, Derrick Haley, John Matthissen, Michael Norris and Jane Storey declared a non-pecuniary interest in application 3844/14 as they knew the applicant as he was a former Mid Suffolk District Councillor.

Councillor Gerard Brewster declared a non-pecuniary interest in application 3930/14 as a member of the Stowmarket Town Council Planning, Consultation and Strategy Committee.

SA27 DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING

It was noted that Members had ben lobbied on application 3844/14.

SA28 DECLARATIONS OF PERSONAL SITE VISITS

There were no declarations of personal site visits.

SA29 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD 23 DECEMBER 2014

The minutes of the meeting held 23 December 2014 were confirmed as a correct record subject to an amendment to include Councillor Jane Storey in the attendance list.

SA24 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Application Number	Representations from
3844/14	Roger Greenacre (Objector) Jeff Vergerson (for the Applicant)

Item1

Application	3844/14
Proposal	Erection of a livestock unit for the housing of free range hens, with associated feed bins and hardstandings
Site Location	STUSTON – Place Farm, Old Bury Road
Applicant	D R and T J Laurie

Following questions from Members, the Senior Environmental Protection Officer advised that the proposed purpose built, modern shed should not generate the nuisances sometimes present with older, different styled units, which were often in converted sheds. Older units used a deep litter system whereas this modern unit would use a conveyor belt allowing the litter to be collected twice a week and placed into trailers. Providing the litter was kept dry a fly issue should not arise.

Roger Greenacre, objector, said there was great strength of feeling within the village as the two petitions presented to the Council showed. However, the timing of the application over the Christmas holiday period had meant there was insufficient time to seek expert advice or visit similar units. The unit was in close proximity to the centre of the village (approximately 250 yards) and the roaming area was adjacent to a resident's garden. Reports had been received from others that indicated odour and flies were a nuisance from sites that were significantly further away from properties. The proposed site could not be worse for residents as the prevailing wind would blow odour, noise and flies to the village and the excrement would wash off the land into the culvert and into the River Waveney. Fly infestations would increase five-fold and rodent problems caused to neighbouring properties. Road safety was already an issue due to HGVs using the village as a shortcut and the danger would eb increased by the

additional traffic to the site. Objectors believed a better location for the proposal could have been found and urged Members to carry out a site visit.

Jeff Vergerson, speaking for the applicant, said that he was a free range egg producer from Norfolk who had advised the applicant on setting up the enterprise. The applicant had been aware of the proximity of the site to the village and had asked for advice on how to mitigate any possible nuisance. Planting would be carried out to mitigate the view and to dampen noise. Vehicle movements would replace those already using the site, eg sugar beet/potato harvesting, and there would no longer be mud on the road as the site would be grassed. Vehicles would use the western access as agreed. Grassing the site would also ensure good drainage. The proposed unit was of the latest design with the birds on multiple levels which allowed 'muck belts' to remove the litter twice weekly into sealed trailers. There would be no build-up of flies as there was with a deep litter system and odours were mitigated. Environment Agency controls would dictate where the muck could be put and how it was dealt with. The operation would be subject to the standards of various organisations and audited on a regular basis. There could be no extension of the business as regulations defined the space required for the hens. All consultees were happy with the proposals subject to the proposed conditions.

Councillor David Burn, Ward Member, said the proposal initially seemed reasonable farm diversification if there was no material detrimental effect on residential amenity. However, there was much local concern regarding the application and any benefit from the proposal must be measured against any adverse effects with regard to noise, smell, vermin, traffic and surface water problems. Smell was the main concern and although computer modelling had been carried out it must be taken at face value that odour would be imperceptible for 98% of the time. The Environmental Health Officer had suggested a condition that a noise assessment be carried out but he found it surprising that standard data was not available for this type of building. He also believed that if Members were minded to approve the application that rodents should be included in the condition requiring a management plan for fly, odour, dust and waste. He said that the fly nuisance referred to would not be caused by flies laying eggs in wet manure, but by cluster flies which were parasitic to earth worms in which they laid their eggs. The earth worm population would increase due to the well manured grassland, as would the cluster fly population. Although cluster flies posed no health risk they did cause a considerable nuisance. Traffic movements would also be a problem and although assurances had been given that vehicles would be advised to use the western approach it was likely that this advice would be ignored and he questioned how this could be enforced. Surface water management was also a concern as the site was on clay and soakaways would hold water. He said if Members were minded to approve the application that adequate conditions were in place and that these were enforceable.

Following a lengthy consideration of the application Members were generally satisfied with the proposal with additional conditions to safeguard residential amenity. A motion to approve the application subject to the following was proposed and seconded:

- Details of external lighting of the building to be agreed, such lighting to be LED only
- Scheme of rodent control and management measures to be agreed and implemented
- Construction and operation traffic management plan to be agreed and implemented

- Range management plan to be agreed
- All HGVs leaving the site to turn left onto the highway
- Building to be used for the housing of free range hens and not for any other use without the prior grant of planning permission
- Scheme of surface water drainage, including details of percolation tests undertaken to be agreed

By 9 votes to 1

Decision – Grant Full Planning Permission subject to the following conditions:

- Time limit
- Development in accordance with approved plans and supporting documents
- Landscaping scheme and management to be agreed and implemented within application site and off site within applicant's ownership
- Facing and roofing materials as specified
- Existing vehicular access to be retained
- Means to prevent surface water drainage onto highway to be agreed
- Details of external lighting of the building to be agreed, such lighting to be LED only
- No external flood lighting permitted
- Noise assessment to be agreed and implemented
- Fly, odour, dust and waste management plan to be agreed and implemented
- Scheme of rodent control and management measures to be agreed and implemented
- Construction and operation traffic management plan to be agreed and implemented
- Range management plan to be agreed
- All HGVs leaving the site to turn left onto the highway
- Building to be used for the housing of free range hens and not for any other use without the prior grant of planning permission
- Scheme of surface water drainage, including details of percolation tests undertaken to be agreed

Item 2

Application	3930/14
Proposal	Re-roof existing Bowls Hall and Creche and installation of Solar PV Array
Site Location	STOWMARKET – Mid Suffolk Leisure Centre, Gainsborough Road
Applicant	Mr Brooks, Brooks Architects

By a unanimous vote

Decision – Grant Full Planning Permission subject to the following conditions:

- Time limit
- Notwithstanding details on application form materials to be agreed
- As approved plans