

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING REFERRALS COMMITTEE** held at the Council Offices, Needham Market on Wednesday 18 March 2015 at 2:30pm

PRESENT: Councillor: Kathie Guthrie – Chairman

Councillors:	Roy Barker	Sarah Mansel
	Gerard Brewster	Wendy Marchant
	Caroline Byles	John Matthissen
	David Burn	Ray Melvin
	Stuart Gemmill	Mike Norris
	Matthew Hicks	Derek Osborne
	Barry Humphreys	Poppy Robinson
	Diana Kearsley	Jane Storey

Also attending: Councillor: Michael Blakenham (Ward Member)
John Field (Ward Member)

In attendance: Corporate Manager – Development Management (PI)
Development Control Officer (MC)
Head of Economy (Planning Sustainable Growth)
Corporate Manager – Strategic Housing
Corporate Manager – Asset Utilisation
Housing Development Officer – Strategic Housing (LB)
Senior Legal Executive (KB)
SCC Highways Development Management Engineer (Peter Black)
SCC Development Contributions Manager (Neil McManus)
Peter Brett Associates (Stuart Cook)
Governance Support Officer (VL)

RF28 APOLOGIES/SUBSTITUTIONS

An apology for absence was received from Councillors Lesley Mayes and Stephen Wright.

RF29 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 Michael Blakenham declared a non-pecuniary interest as he lived within one mile of the site and had also submitted two land bids for land in the locality.

RF30 DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING

It was noted that all Members had been lobbied on application 3310/14.

RF31 DECLARATIONS OF PERSONAL SITE VISITS

There were no declarations of personal site visits.

RF32 APPLICATION 3310/14

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

Planning Application Number	Representations From
3310/14	Shirley Fairburn (Parish Council) Paul High/Erica Whettingsteel (Agent) – to answer questions only

Application Number:	3310/14
Proposal:	Erection of 270 dwellings comprising 110 x 2 bedroom houses, 135 x 3 bedroom houses and 25 x 4 bedroom houses and associated garaging/car parking, landscaping, play areas and access to Bramford Road, together with the construction of a convenience store with 6 x 2 bedroom flats above, associated parking and servicing areas on land at Hackneys Corner
Site Location:	GREAT BLAKENHAM – Land between Gipping and Bramford Road
Applicant:	Mr High, Orbit Homes (2020) Limited

The application was referred to the Planning Referrals Committee for the following reasons:

- It was a 'Major' application for a residential development for 15 or over dwellings
- The Head of Economy considered the application to be of a controversial nature having regard to the location, scale and/or nature of the application
- Having regard to its strategic nature the Chairman of Committee considered it appropriate.

The Development Control Officer advised that following comments received from SCC Highways two proposed conditions had been amended as per the tabled papers. This was to ensure that emergency access was put in before implementation of the Bramford Road entrance and that highway works were completed prior to occupation of the 63rd dwelling (219th dwelling of overall site).

Shirley Fairburn said the Parish Council supported the application but with reservations. The parking was considered inadequate particularly in view of existing problems on the site and drainage was an immense issue largely due to existing drains being blocked. There was also concern regarding the Hackneys Corner junction as although it had been stated that an additional 400 houses did not warrant a bigger junction, consideration had not been given to the number of large lorries that passed through the village on their way to Needham Market. It was already a very dangerous junction.

Councillor Michael Blakenham, Ward Member, said he had supported the original application as a good use of a brownfield site which would have provided much on site infrastructure for use of new and existing residents. Unfortunately, this proposal omitted much of that infrastructure and although there were compensatory elements, eg contribution for education, it was unclear where the facilities would be situated. The 900 Great Blakenham residents would become 1,800 residents with little community infrastructure if the proposal went ahead. The development would put pressure on school places and the village was already short of medical facilities. Justification for the change was based on viability but he considered that developers could accept a lower profit margin and make an increased contribution towards infrastructure.

Councillor John Field, Ward Member, said he had been cautiously in favour of development in the past but since having irate meetings with residents and Dan Poulter MP he had changed his mind. He now believed the proposal was dumping development in Great Blakenham to the detriment of existing residents. Many concessions had been made to get the site completed and residents were incensed that little had been provided to help with existing problems, eg shortage of medical and community facilities. The village was faced with a very large expansion and the probability of a further 200 homes being built on another site nearby. There were serious concerns regarding the impact of the additional traffic, in particular the Chapel Lane bus junction, congestion at the level crossing and B1113 traffic lights and Hackneys Corner needed to be remodelled. No pedestrian crossing was provided near the Chequers Public House which was a busy crossing point. Many additional primary school places would be needed and the new school proposed in the original application was no longer included putting great pressure on Claydon Primary School. Local medical facilities were also poor and no solutions were proposed to cope with the increased workload. Although there was a village shop planned there were no firm plans on how this would be delivered. He felt the conditions and phasing of payments was confusing and would lead to the same situation again with conflicting beliefs of what was due and when. The development was too large for the location and he asked that permission not be granted until issues regarding infrastructure were resolved.

Members discussed the application at length and clarified various issues with the Officers present.

Opinion was divided. Some Members felt the proposed development was unsustainable in the location without the provision of additional on-site infrastructure and further improvements to the highway system.

Others felt that it was good use of a brownfield site and as the SCC responses confirmed that there would be sufficient education and health provision in the locality the proposal should be supported. It was felt that all that could be done to alleviate parking problems had been with spaces provided to the new standards.

Some concern was expressed regarding the phasing of payments and these being made on time, particularly in view of past difficulties. A motion for approval subject to an additional heads of term requiring a more detailed form of monitoring, eg written reports to identify any potential breaches, and also an additional condition requiring a scheme for surface water management to be agreed was proposed and seconded.

By 12 votes to 5

Decision – That authority be delegated to the Corporate Manager – Development Management to grant planning permission subject to the prior execution of a Section 106 on terms to the satisfaction of the Corporate Manager – Development Management to secure the following heads of terms:

- 0.76ha public open space on site
- £150,000 children’s play equipment to be provided by Orbit
- Long term management and maintenance of open space and play equipment by Orbit
- Sports field to be transferred to MSDC prior to commencement of development
- Triangle of corner of sports field to be licensed to MSDC at time of transfer of sports field
- £537,000 commuted sum for sports provision to include £100,000 to be drawn down on 30 days’ notice at the MSDC request from time of transfer of sports field
- £50,000 commuted sum towards Great Blakenham Community Hall or Parish Rooms
- £63,000 to increase capacity at Claydon and Barham Surgery
- £1,382,558 commuted sum towards education and early years provision
- Provision of shop and marketing and letting strategy prior to occupation of 29th dwelling of this application (185th dwelling of overall site)
- Phasing
- Notify Councils of occupation at each trigger point
- MSDC monitoring fees
- Subject to Orbit providing the obligations set out above, MSDC and SCC to hold in abeyance enforcement action in respect of the comparable outstanding obligations in the extant agreement which have already been triggered
- All financial contributions to be index linked
- The extant agreement will be amended to discharge the obligations to provide a police station and £80,000 commuted sum for police
- The remainder of the extant agreement will remain as it stands
- Scheme of Section 106 Obligation monitoring and recording to be agreed with written reporting to the Local Planning Authority on completion of each dwelling and then upon first occupation of each dwelling. Scheme to include nominated person with responsibility for monitoring, reporting and liaison with the Local Planning Authority

and that such permission be subject to the following conditions:

- 3 year time limit

- Approved plans
- Scheme of hard and soft landscaping for plots
- Scheme of hard and soft structural landscaping
- Tree protection in accordance with details submitted with application
- Scheme of hard and soft landscaping for Hackneys Corner piece
- Management and maintenance of structural landscaping
- Land contamination remediation
- Noise assessment in relation to local centre
- Mechanical ventilation and air conditioning for retail unit
- Opening hours for retail unit: 07:00 until 23:00 Monday to Saturday and 10:00 until 16:00 Sundays and Bank Holidays
- Delivery hours for retail unit: 08:00 until 18:00 Monday to Saturday and no deliveries on Sundays or Bank Holidays
- Construction hours: 07:30 until 17:30 Monday to Friday, 08:00 until 13:00 on Saturdays and no working on Sundays or Bank Holidays
- Construction management plan to include no parking up or laying over of vehicles on Bramford Road, Gipping Road or Chapel Lane
- Provision of fire hydrants
- Provision of Bramford Road junction and associated works along Bramford Road prior to occupation of 4th dwelling (160th dwelling of overall site) unless an alternative emergency access has been provided prior to occupation of 4th dwelling (160th dwelling overall) and in any event provision of Bramford Road junction and associated works along Bramford Road no later than occupation of 98th dwelling (254th dwelling overall)
- Provision of remainder of highway works prior to occupation of 63rd dwelling (219th dwelling of overall site)
- Details of estate roads and footpaths
- Construction of carriageways and footways to binder course level prior to occupation
- Provision and retention of areas for parking, loading and manoeuvring at local centre
- Garages to be used for no other purpose than parking of vehicles
- Levels across site and to include finished floor levels
- Details of materials prior to commencement of development
- Scheme to demonstrate that water will not overflow onto Gipping Road or the level crossing
- Details of boundary treatments prior to commencement of development
- Shop unit to be restricted to Class A1 use only
- Provision of travel plan
- Layout, provide and make available for use Hackneys Corner Piece prior to occupation of 29th dwelling (185th dwelling of overall site)
- Scheme for long term management and maintenance of Hackneys Corner Piece
- Phasing scheme
- Scheme and timetable for surface water drainage management for [a] construction and [b] occupation phases of the development shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development as permitted commences. The scheme as agreed shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the agreed timetable.