

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING REFERRALS COMMITTEE** held at the Council Offices, Needham Market on Wednesday 4 February 2015 at 2:30pm

PRESENT: Councillor: Kathie Guthrie – Chairman

Councillors:	Roy Barker	Wendy Marchant
	Gerard Brewster	Lesley Mayes
	Matthew Hicks	Mike Norris
	Diana Kearsley	Jane Storey
	Sarah Mansel	

Also attending: Councillor Penny Otton (SCC Ward Member)

In attendance: Corporate Manager – Development Management (PI)
Planning Officer (MP)
Viability Officer
Housing Development Officer – Strategic Housing (LB)
Governance Support Officer (VL)

RF22 APOLOGIES/SUBSTITUTIONS

An apology for absence was received from Councillors David Burn, John Field, Stuart Gemmill, John Matthissen, Ray Melvin, Derek Osborne, Poppy Robinson and Stephen Wright.

RF23 DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY OR NON-PECUNIARY INTEREST

Councillor Matthew Hicks declared a non-pecuniary interest by virtue of being a Suffolk County Councillor with Assistant Cabinet Member for Education and Skills responsibility.

RF24 DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING

It was noted that all Members had been lobbied on application 2452/14.

RF25 DECLARATIONS OF PERSONAL SITE VISITS

There were no declarations of personal site visits.

RF26 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD 24 SEPTEMBER 2014

The minutes of the meeting held 24 September 2014 were confirmed as a correct record.

RF27 APPLICATION 2452/14

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

Planning Application Number Representations From

C Balaam Objector
P Scarlett Agent

Application Number: **2452/14**

Proposal: Demolition of existing industrial buildings and erection of 11 no dwellings and amended access

Site Location: **ONEHOUSE** – Land at Red Willows Industrial Estate, Finborough Road

Applicant: Hartog Hutton

The application had been considered by Development Control Committee A on 3 December 2014. At that meeting the Committee resolved:

‘That Members are minded to grant Planning Permission and that the application be reported to Planning Committee on that basis subject to negotiation and viability assessment to [a] secure Section 106 as recommendation and [b] minded that such permission be subject to the conditions as recommended.’

C Balaam said that he had circulated a letter to Members from the objectors stating their support for the original application for nine dwellings and objecting to this revised application on the grounds of lack of communication and transparency by MSDC. Objections were also made regarding the overall architectural appearance which was considered to resemble a barrack block or a residential block at a workhouse.

Paul Scarlett, the agent, said the site had a long history of unregulated use which had resulted in an adverse impact on neighbour amenity. There had been substantial consultation with the parish council and community and widespread support had been shown at the public exhibition. The Highways Department were satisfied with the proposed access and the proposal was an opportunity to provide affordable housing and also improve the amenity of the area. A rigorous viability examination had demonstrated that the scheme could only proceed with the proposed three affordable units and contribution of £68,000. It was a sustainable development which met Core Strategy and national Planning policy Framework policies.

Councillor Penny Otton, spoke on behalf of the Ward Member and as the Suffolk County Councillor for the Electoral Division. She said that although there was local support for the proposal this was conditional on the 30mph speed limit being extended to cover Finborough Road from the town boundary to Burford Bridge. A petition signed by 105 local people to this effect had been submitted to Suffolk County Council (SCC). If approved the cost of implementing the speed limit would have to be met locally and the Committee was asked to condition the use of Section 106 monies for this. If the application was approved it was likely that 20+ additional vehicles would be accessing the road from this development and it was considered that this number would usually access the highway within a 30mph limit. Concern was also expressed regarding pedestrian safety as the footpath did not as stated extend from the site into the town; there were breaks in the path where houses accessed the highway and used the area to park cars.

SA/04/15

Members had sympathy with residents' concerns regarding the speed limit but it was noted that the Highways Department were satisfied that the improved access arrangements met highway safety needs. It was agreed to approve the application but Officers were requested to write to Suffolk County Council supporting the lowering of the speed limit and also requesting that consideration be given to the footway issues that had been raised.

By a unanimous vote

Decision – Subject to no new materials considerations arising from publicity that authority be delegated to the Corporate Manager – Development Management to grant planning permission subject to the execution of a Section 106 on terms to the satisfaction of the Corporate Manager – Development Management to secure the following heads of terms:

- Affordable housing – 3 units for affordable rent
- OSSI – £28,000
- Suffolk County Council education – £40,194

and that such permission be subject to the following conditions:

- 3 year time limit
- Highways access and layout
- External lighting details – LED only
- Samples of materials
- Scheme of hard and soft landscaping including planting and fencing to the rear of site
- Contamination
- Parking
- Phasing
- Scheme of sustainability measures during construction and occupation
- Details of surface water run off management
- Cycle storage provision
- Biodiversity mitigation and enhancement measures to be agreed to river corridor area

Note: Corporate Manager – Development Management to write a side letter to Suffolk County Council supporting the lowering of the speed limit in the locality and requesting that the highway authority have regard to the footway issues raised during the consideration of the application