

## MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** held at the Council Offices, Needham Market on Wednesday 24 September 2014 at 2.00pm

**PRESENT:** Councillor: Matthew Hicks – Chairman

Councillors:	Roy Barker	Sarah Mansel
	Gerard Brewster	Wendy Marchant
	David Burn	John Matthissen
	John Field	Ray Melvin
	Stuart Gemmill	Mike Norris
	Kathie Guthrie	Derek Osborne
	Diana Kearsley	Jane Storey

**In attendance:** Corporate Manager – Development Management (PI)  
Senior Development Management Planning Officer (ET)  
Enabling Officer (Heritage) (PH)  
Senior Governance Support Officer (LS)  
Governance Support Officer (JB)

### RF16 APOLOGIES/SUBSTITUTIONS

An apology for absence was received from Councillors Caroline Byles, Barry Humphreys, Lesley Mayes, Poppy Robinson and Stephen Wright.

### RF17 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.

Councillor Jane Storey advised the Committee that she had not taken part in the site inspection for Application No. 2700/12 and would not speak or vote on the item.

### RF18 DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING

There were no declarations of interest.

### RF19 DECLARATIONS OF PERSONAL SITE VISITS

There were no declarations of personal site visits.

### RF20 APPLICATION 2613/11

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

Planning Application Number	Representations From
2700/12	Mrs C Beaumont (Supporter) Mr J Carr (Agent for Applicant)

**Note: Members had a 10 minute break before the first application to allow time to review papers received that morning.**

Application Number:	<b>2613/11</b>
Proposal:	Outline application for residential and retail development with demolition of existing structures and new access road (application for a new planning permission to replace extant planning permission OL/140/04 in order to extend the time limit for implementation)
Site Location:	<b>THURSTON</b> – Thurston Granary, Station Hill
Applicant:	Playdri Products Ltd

The updated application had been considered by Development Control Committee A on 26 March 2014. At that meeting Members resolved to grant outline planning permission subject to securing a proportion of the residential element as affordable housing together with other contributions in respect of infrastructure. During subsequent negotiation the terms of the S106 planning obligation sought was challenged by the applicant and an appeal was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on the grounds that the Council had failed to determine the application within the statutory 13 week period allowed for a major application.

Councillor Sam Powell, Ward Member, asked the Chairman to read out an email in relation to the proposed development advising Members that:

‘I fully support our Officer’s recommendations to refuse. There is absolutely no benefit to the local community whatsoever and nothing to be gained by the residents of Thurston if this becomes a residential development. Thurston continues to cry out for affordable homes and to have no provision secured on a proposed development of this size, is contrary to this Council’s policy. As you are aware, we would look to negotiate up to 35% contribution. Over the time of this application, it has been eroded to a minimum of 10%. At least as a business site it will continue to offer employment locally. Thurston must secure affordable homes for local people who wish to continue to live and work here.’

Councillor Derrick Haley, Ward Member, asked the Chairman to read out an email in relation to the proposed development advising Members that:

‘Since 2004 there has been a number of applications regarding this site, which is now some 10 years ago, and nothing has changed over that period. I have always supported development of this site even though I considered that it was really the last employment site in the village of any size and would have liked it to remain so. Thurston is a popular village for a number of reasons and so therefore any development for building homes must have affordable housing as part of that development. I therefore have come to the conclusion that the summary as outlined on page 6 of the report is very much my opinion about this application also. The important words in the summary are as follows “without any significant benefit to the local community (either in terms of providing affordable housing, improved

amenity or highway safety). It will be up to the Committee to make a decision on this application but I hope that they support the recommendation as written on page 7 of the report.'

Members asked several questions relating to the proposed development and expressed their concerns about the lack of parking spaces for the size of development and affordable housing not coming forward as part of the proposal. They felt that the proposal fell short of the requirements of the village.

By a unanimous vote

**Decision** – Having regard to the appeal against non-determination that the position of the Council be stated that it would have been minded to REFUSE the application on the following grounds:

The proposal, by reason of a failure to secure any of the residential element of the mixed use scheme as affordable housing for the benefit of the local community would be contrary to the Council's Altered Policy H4 and would furthermore represent an unsustainable form of development contrary to the objective of the National Planning Policy Framework as they relate to sustainable economic development, and in particular paragraphs 7, 8, 17, 19, 51, 70, 131 and 187.

Having regard to the details which the appellant wishes to be included within the appeal the proposed development fails to contribute to making the place better for people and does not represent good design. The proposal would not be sustainable development having regard to the potential conflict between pedestrian and vehicle users within the site having regard to the flats, shops, adjacent railway station and the adequacy of proposed parking arrangements. The proposed retail units having regard to their size would moreover fail to demonstrate that the scheme will safeguard the retention of local shops. Ont that basis the proposal is contrary to paragraphs 28, 32 and 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework and contrary to policies FC1 and FC1.1 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy Focused Review 2012

**Note: Members had a 5 minute break at this point.**

## **RF21 APPLICATION 2700/12**

Application Number:	<b>2700/12</b>
Proposal:	Partial demolition of the Grade II Listed North Warehouse and refurbishment of the remaining Warehouse for mixed commercial and residential uses. Demolition of all other buildings on the Application Site and erection of a total of 176 residential dwellings of two to five storeys comprising (FULL) details of 73 dwellings, the locations of which are shown on drawing number 18449/501 and (OUTLINE) for a further area to provide 103 dwellings, the location of which is shown on drawing number 18449/501. Modifications to Paper Mill Lane including provisions of new access to the Application Site and associated external areas including car parking,

onsite access roads and footpaths, formal landscaped areas and natural landscaped areas  
Site Location: **BRAMFORD** – Land at the former Scotts/Fisons site, Paper Mill Lane, Bramford  
Applicant: Mr Brackenbury, Paper Mill Lane Properties Ltd

The Senior Development Management Planning Office set out the key issues relating to the application including the principles of the development, landscaping, highways and footpaths and Section 106 contributions.

Mrs Beaumont, Supporter, advised that she was the nearest resident to the site and applauded and recognised the need for development. Although she supported the application she expressed her concerns about loss of privacy and the increased traffic using the lane, including HGV vehicles.

James Carr, Agent for the Applicant, advised Members that he had worked with the Council's Planning Officers for three years on this project. He advised that two viability assessments had been carried out on the site and that the listed buildings would be retained in order to keep the character of the area.

Councillor John Field, Ward Member, spoke of his support for the application and the retention of a major listed building. He felt that the claw back relating to the S106 was a concern and also the increased traffic on Paper Mill lane and hoped that traffic calming would be put in place.

Members were pleased to see the retention of the listed buildings and felt the design of the development had been well thought out. They expressed concerns relating to Paper Mill Lane and the problems with traffic and also hoped that calming measures could be put in place.

By 12 votes to 2 with 1 abstention

**Decision** – That Planning Permission be granted subject to the completion of a section 106 planning obligation on terms to the satisfaction of the Corporate Manager – Development Management. The section 106 agreement will secure the following heads of terms:

- phasing scheme to secure the delivery of the repair and conversion of the former Fisons building concurrent with the commencement of development and delivery of completed works ready for occupation within timetable aligned to the phased build out of residential development
- traffic calming measures along Paper Mill Lane
- footway and foot path links and improvement works to be made available and retained for public use in phased arrangement with implementation of project
- education contribution linked to phased occupation of dwellings
- viability review and “claw back” mechanism to enable review of unsecured obligations

That planning permission subject to conditions as per the recommendation be granted