

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** held at the Council Offices, Needham Market on Wednesday 12 March 2014 at 2.00pm

PRESENT: Councillor Mrs D K Guthrie – Chairman

Councillors:	R J Barker	Mrs W Marchant
	G M Brewster	J E Matthissen
	D M Burn	Mrs L M Mayes
	J D Field	R M Melvin
	S J Gemmill	D J Osborne
	M J R Hicks	Mrs P J E Robinson
	Mrs S E Mansel	

Ward Member: Councillor G Green

In attendance: Corporate Manager – Development Management (PI)
Senior Development Management Planning Officer (JPG)
Corporate Manager – Building Control
Corporate Manager – Asset Utilisation
Economic Development Officer (DE)
Governance Support Officer (JB/VMC)

RF01 APOLOGIES/SUBSTITUTIONS

An apology for absence was received from Councillors T A Curran, Mrs D Kearsley, M G Norris, Mrs J C Storey and S J Wright.

RF02 DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY OR NON-PECUNIARY INTEREST

None declared.

RF03 DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING

None declared.

RF04 DECLARATIONS OF PERSONAL SITE VISITS

None declared.

RFO5 APPLICATION 2722/13

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

Planning Application Number Representations From

0759/12/12

J Bailey (Agent)

Application Number:

2722/13

Proposal:

Full Planning Permission for: Erection of 215 dwellings/flats with associated garaging, private and visitor parking, sheds and accesses. Provision of public open space and landscaping, including SUDS and attenuation basin. Construction of new estate access road and junction improvements.

Outline Planning Permission (with all matters reserved except for access and landscaping) for: Change of use of 1.34 ha land to A3, A4, B1, B8, C1, D1, D2 uses.

Outline Planning Permission (with all matters reserved except for landscaping) for: Change of use of land to school.

Site Location:

STOWMARKET (also in the Parishes of Haughley and Onehouse) – Land at Chilton Leys, Bury Road

Applicant:

Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

The Senior Development Management Planning Officer advised that a great deal of work had been carried out between the applicant and the Council to bring forward the application before Members. Following the previous deferral further exploration had been undertaken into appropriate Section 106 contributions resulting in the amendments detailed in the report. The recommendation to the Committee was one of approval.

The Corporate Manager – Asset Utilisation informed the Committee that all component parts of the applicant's costs had been interrogated thoroughly. He confirmed that following this detailed analysis, himself, the Planning Officer and Suffolk County Council Section 106 Manager were all satisfied that the figures were reasonable. He advised that a review mechanism was in place to capture additional monies if the scheme exceeded profit expectations.

The Corporate Manager – Building Control advised the Committee that building regulations would ensure that all properties were constructed to a good rating of energy efficiency and he was confident that the proposed development would exceed the current average score. The additional requirements to meet Sustainable Code Level 3 as detailed on page 29 of the report were noted as was the Officer recommendation that they not be included within the build.

James Bailey, Agent, said that he believed the questions arising at the previous meeting had now been addressed. The site was the largest allocated site in Mid Suffolk and the proposed development would make a large contribution to the Council's five year land supply. The application had been through all the appropriate procedures culminating in the Development Brief. There had been detailed engagement and negotiation with stakeholders and the public and he believed it was an excellent example of planning in practice. A detailed viability study had been undertaken by independent experts. This was the first phase of a larger site and elements not allocated in this phase could be brought forward in the later phases and some elements, for example the school, had been brought forward earlier.

Councillor Mrs R J Eburne, Ward Member, commenting by email said that she was pleased to see the changes that had been made to the application. She welcomed the changes to the Section 106 matters, particularly in relation to affordable housing and health provision. However, she was disappointed that while the development was supposed to be sustainable the quality of housing was not so due to the lack of renewable energy measures and sustainable design. She asked that if members were minded to approve the application that the proposed condition for the review of Section 106 matters was strengthened ensuring that it was subject to timely and regular checks.

Councillor J Matthissen, Ward Member, advised Members that the development and conditions proposed fell far short of what was set out in the recently approved Development Brief and that it was certainly not sustainable and failed to deliver relevant strategic priorities of the District Council. He supported the outline designation to distance the housing development from the A14 and welcomed the proposed conditions to protect the existing town centre. The dismissal of policies CS3, CS4 and CS5 was unacceptable as in each case the intentions of the policy were not met and while it might be acceptable to reach an on balance approval while setting aside one of these policies, dismissing all three could not be right. Overall this development did not deliver sustainable development as required by policy FC1. Access into Chilton Hall via footpath and cycle links should be made a condition of any approval. The separate application approach posed many problems in considering the application and should not have been accepted. The overall design and layout were not acceptable as they were not distinctive nor did they deliver low energy use. A condition should be implemented requiring all external lighting to use LED. Should the Committee wish to approve the application, there should be a condition to protect all the zones planned for structural landscaping, in order to allow natural regeneration to occur over the likely 5 – 10 years before building of phases 2 and 3 took place.

Members were generally satisfied that the areas which had required further information and were pleased that these had now been addressed.

By 12 votes to 0 with 1 abstention

Decision – Grant planning permission as per the recommendation