

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of the **MID SUFFOLK DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE B** held at the Council Chamber, Mid Suffolk District Council Offices, High Street, Needham Market on Wednesday, 22 March 2017

PRESENT:

Councillors:	Kathie Guthrie (Chairman)	John Levantis
	Roy Barker (Vice-Chairman)	Dave Muller
	Julie Flatman	Mike Norris
	Jessica Fleming	Keith Welham

Ward Members: Lavinia Hadingham

In attendance:

Senior Development Management Planning Officer (JPG)
Development Management Planning Officer (JaPI/RB)
Legal Services Businesses Partner (JH)
Governance Support Officer (VL/HH)

153 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE/SUBSTITUTIONS**

An apology for absence was received from Councillors Barry Humphreys MBE and Jane Storey.

154 **TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY OR NON-PECUNIARY INTEREST BY MEMBERS**

Councillor Lavinia Hadingham declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to Application 4410/16 by reason of her son attending Fressingfield Scout Group. Councillor Julie Flatman declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to Application 4410/16 by reason of her family attending Fressingfield Medical Centre.

155 **DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING**

Councillor John Levantis declared he had been lobbied by email on Application 4410/16.

156 **DECLARATIONS OF PERSONAL SITE VISITS**

There were no declarations of personal site visits.

157 **TO RECEIVE NOTIFICATION OF PETITIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COUNCIL'S PETITION SCHEME**

None received.

158 **QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC**

None received.

159 **QUESTIONS BY COUNCILLORS**

None received.

160 **SA/05/17 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

Schedule of Planning Applications

Application Number	Representations from
4410/16	Garry Deeks (Parish Council) Paul Woodward (Objector) Dawn Carmen-Jones (Supporter) George Barrett (Applicant) Sue Challis (Independent Highway Consultant for the applicant)
3469/16	Peter Dow (Parish Council)

Item 1

Application Proposal	4410/16 Hybrid application comprising: Full Planning permission for the erection of a new Scout Headquarters Building, with associated facilities and access road and Outline Planning Permission for the construction of up to 28 residential dwellings with all matters reserved (access, layout, landscape, appearance and scale) (revised scheme to planning application 2285/15)
Site Location	FRESSINGFIELD – Land and Buildings at Red House Farm, Priory Road
Applicant	Mr and Mrs Barrett and The First Fressingfield Scout Group

The Case Officer presented the Application to Members who raised questions including how pedestrians could access the village safely once the site had been completed. It was considered that the safest route was to follow Priory Road as it was not possible to provide a continuous footpath along New Street. It was considered that the Application had addressed the previous reason for refusal and safe pedestrian access to facilities was now provided. Members followed this up by querying the Suffolk County Council Highway statement on page 45 in relation to a footpath along the northern side of New Street. It was clarified that there was only 1.5 metres of land available and that the advised width for a public footpath was 1.8 metres.

Gerry Deeks, Vice Chairman for the Parish Council, said that it was unfortunate that it was a hybrid application, as the Parish Council supported the Scout Hut but not the housing development. Mr Deeks therefore wished the application to be delayed so a village survey could explore the opinions of the residents to find the most

suitable sites for developments. He informed the Committee that the footpath to the school was not a safe option as it was only open during school hours. He informed Members that several traffic incidences had occurred over the years in New Street and that the safety requirements were still not met by the application by changing the access route to that proposed.

Members questioned Mr Deeks regarding the suggested footpath along New Street and he responded that New Street was not suitable for pedestrians as the road was full of bends. He confirmed that the new location of the Scout Hut was welcomed by the Parish Council as the dropping off and picking up children at the current Scout Hut was creating traffic congestion in the street during peak times.

Paul Woodward, an Objector, informed Members he represented two groups, one of those living close to the site and another wider group of residents looking at the totality of development. There was concern about the number of schemes coming forward which were being considered on a piecemeal basis and which if approved could double the number of houses in the village. He said there were 32 objectors and only two supporters. It was felt the revised access arrangements for New Street and the proposed pedestrian access via Priory Road did not address the previous reason for refusal. To add a footpath was unacceptable as the street was too narrow. They were also concerns about putting the sewer system under strain. He explained the large number of dwellings proposed would put pressure on the local medical centre and the primary school. He asked the Committee to apply reasonable assessment when considering the infrastructure, the highways, the medical centre and the primary school and urged rejection of the proposal as the residents, the Parish Council and Suffolk County Council Highways did not support the application.

Members requested clarification of the number of objectors and were informed that there were multiple letters from 14 properties totalling 32 letters in all.

Dawn Carmen-Jones, a Supporter said that there were 120 scouts between the age of eight to eighteen. The existing hall, had no running water, poor lighting or toilet facilities. When parents dropped off their children it caused congestion on the street and only the diligence of the scout leaders and parents ensured that the children remained safe. The proposed site would allow safe access and there would be a safe route within the village to allow children to walk to the new Scout Hut. She also pointed out that no other landowner had come forward with a proposed, suitable site for the Scouts. Mrs Carmen - Jones said the proposed site would provide a safe environment for the children and that Fressingfield needed more new homes.

Members questioned the location of the separate toilet block away from the main building. Mrs Carmen-Jones responded that there was no objection to moving the toilet block to become an extension of the main building if required. Clarification was also given regarding the number of children and volunteers that lived in the village and the proposed car parking arrangements.

George Barrett, the applicant said that he lived in Fressingfield and it was a charming and quiet village and he would like it to remain as such. He said work on the application had been ongoing for the past three years since he had offered the

First Fressingfield Scouts Group land for a new Scout Hut. The Parish Council, Mid Suffolk District Council and Suffolk District Council Highways had all visited the site and he had been led to believe that they were positive towards the proposal. Mr Barrett had therefore proceeded with the application only for a recommendation of refusal from Suffolk County Council Highways on the grounds of unsuitable access road to New Street. He considered this issue resolved in the revised application, which included the suggested new pedestrian route along Priory Road and the inclusion of a turning point for delivery vehicles.

Members questioned Sue Challis, the applicant's Independent Highways Consultant on various issues including the proposed pedestrian access and her opinion regarding the possibility of providing a footpath along New Street. She said she did not believe a footpath on New Street was a safe option as it was not possible to implement this along the full length of the highway without pedestrians being required to cross the road.

Councillor Lavinia Hadingham, Ward Member, supported the application. The applicant and Planning Officers had worked together to bring forward a revised application that resolved the previous reasons for refusal. The Scouts was a popular and well attended group who badly needed a new hall as the current accommodation was not suitable. The traffic problems caused by the parents dropping off and picking up children were considerable. She said Fressingfield needed more houses and the proposed development would provide badly needed affordable homes.

Members generally considered that the proposed access from New Street and pedestrian route via Priory Road addressed the previous concerns and the application was satisfactory. However, it was felt that the toilet/shower block would be better moved or attached to the main building though retaining its separate access. A proposal to delegate to Officers to negotiate re-siting of the toilet/shower block was moved and seconded. This included the conditions be amended to read 'up to date *ecological* surveys to be submitted' and that an additional noise condition be included.

By 7 votes to 1.

Decision –

- 1) That authority be delegated to the Professional Lead - Growth and Sustainable Planning to Grant Full Planning Permission for the Scout Hut subject to the relocation of the shower block and achieving a cycle path to southern link.
- 2) Outline Planning Permission for the housing development of up to 28 dwellings; subject to the prior completion of a Section 106 or Undertaking on terms to their satisfaction to secure the following heads of terms and that such permission be subject to the conditions as set out below:

Section 106 to provide

Affordable Housing of 35%

Conditions for Full Planning Permission Only

Time Limit for commencement

Accord with approved plans

Retain boundary hedgerows and trees

Prior to commencement of development agree written scheme of investigation for archaeological works

Prior to occupation complete and agree site investigation and post investigation assessment

Prior to commencement agree details of estate road and footpaths

Construct carriageway and footways prior to occupation

Use shall not commence until parking and manoeuvring area provided and thereafter retained

Agree details of external equipment such as air source heat pumps, kitchen extraction and ventilation systems prior to their installation

- Prior to commencement of development lighting strategy to be agreed in order to protect neighbour amenity and biodiversity
- Prior to commencement Drainage strategy to Scout Hut.
- No hard standing to be constructed prior to installation of the surface water drainage strategy has been implemented
- Prior to commencement (including site clearance) mitigation and enhancement measures based on up-to-date ecological surveys to be submitted and agreed
- Prior to commencement details of hard and soft landscaping including boundary treatments
- Implementation of hard and soft landscaping and replacement of dead or dying landscaping
- Prior to occupation position of fire hydrants to be agreed and installed accordingly
- The footway link to Priory Road shall be made available prior to the occupation and retained to allow public access
- Prior to works above slab level, precise details of the external materials to be agreed
- Construction working hours to be 07:30 to 18:00 Monday - Friday and 08:00 to 13:00 Saturdays. No working on Sundays or Bank Holidays
- Construction Management Plan to be agreed and implemented accordingly.
- Details of gate to Fire Path to be agreed prior to occupation
- Details of traffic signs to be agreed prior to occupation
- Details of cycle storage to be agreed prior to occupation

Outline Permission – New dwellings

- Time limit for submission of Reserved Matters and commencement
- In accordance with approved plans

- Prior to commencement of development agree written scheme of investigation for archaeological works
- Prior to occupation complete and agree site investigation and post investigation assessment
- Prior to commencement agree details of estate road and footpaths
- Construct carriageway and footways prior to occupation
- Prior to commencement of development lighting strategy to be agreed in order to protect neighbour amenity and biodiversity
- Prior to commencement drainage strategy to be agreed
- No hard standing to be constructed prior to installation of the surface water drainage strategy has been implemented
- Development shall be constructed, completed and overseen in accordance with the Construction Environmental Management Plan and Ecology Reports
- Prior to commencement details of hard and soft landscaping including boundary treatments
- Implementation of hard and soft landscaping and replacement of dead or dying landscaping
- Prior to occupation position of fire hydrants to be agreed and installed accordingly
- The footway link to Priory Road shall be made available prior to the occupation and made available for public use
- Prior to works above slab level, precise details of the external materials to be agreed.
- Construction working hours to be 07:30 to 18:00 Monday-Friday and 08:00 to 13:00 Saturdays. No working on Sundays or Bank Holidays
- Construction Management Plan to be agreed and implemented accordingly
- Details of gate to Fire Path to be agreed prior to occupation
- Details of traffic signs to be agreed prior to occupation
- Prior to commencement (including site clearance) mitigation and enhancement measures based on up-to-date ecological surveys to be submitted and agreed
- Noise conditions

1) That in the event of the Planning Obligation referred to in Resolution (1) above not being secured that the Professional Lead - Growth and Sustainable Planning be authorised to refuse planning permission on appropriate grounds.

Item 2

Application	3469/16
Proposal	Outline Planning Application sought (will all matters other than means of access reserved) for residential

development of up to 60 dwellings with associated car parking, landscaping, public open space areas, pedestrian/cycle links and vehicular access from Borley Crescent

Site Location	ELMSWELL – Land to the east of Borley Crescent, IP30 9UG
Applicant	Mr M Jewers

The Case Officer made the following amendments:

- Page 81, Summary – line 3 should read: The proposed development represents an increase in housing supply
- Page 84 and 93: the CIL bids will be made solely for the primary education

Peter Dow, Parish Council, was opposed to the plan and said there was no cohesion between proposed applications in Elmswell. He said a wider strategic view was needed and the total of 900 new dwellings proposed in Elmswell represented a 56% uplift of the current housing stock. He reminded Members that this almost equated to the combined size of Elmswell and Thurston together. He explained that the current Harris Bacon Factory site on which work had already begun were likely to breach the capacity of Elmswell Primary School and that no consideration had been taken of secondary education for the influx of new students. Woolpit Medical Centre was also under increased pressure. He was in disagreement with the way the applicant had used the earlier statistical evidence tendered by SCC Highways. He also said that Highways had advised that further development would cause a greater impact on the level crossing. He urged the Committee to reject the application as it was a development on a greenfield site and on grounds of safety at the level crossing and to look at all proposed developments in a strategic way.

Councillor John Levantis, Ward Member, explained to Members that residents felt threatened by the growing number of developments. The issue with this development was the congestion it would create by the level crossing, already increased by the Harris Bacon Factory development north of the site. The Primary School and the Medical Centre was due to be expanded and CIL funding was allocated to both. He supported the application despite the traffic problems as the development provided 35% of affordable housing

Members questioned Councillor Levantis with regards to the train crossing, and he considered that the on street parking created more traffic problems than closed gates. The location of bus stops was considered and the Case Officer confirmed that the bus stops were to be improved.

Councillor Sarah Mansel, Ward Member commented by email and said that the community felt threatened by the number of proposed developments in the village and the impact on infrastructure. She understood that each planning application needed to be determined on its own merits but a more strategic approach would be

better. Residents were concerned about long delays at the train crossing and felt the development on the old Bacon Factory site and the addition of the proposed development would make it worse. Councillor Mansel said that residents were concerned about the primary and secondary schools in the village. It was predicted that by 2019 the primary school would be full and it was likely that new residents' children would have to be transported out of the village for their education until the schools could be expanded. She also said Woolpit Health Centre was over-subscribed by 50% and needed further funding. She felt that public transport in the village would benefit from a new bus route north of the railway line. She also requested that the footpath from the proposed development along the railway line be upgraded to a shared cycle/pedestrian path and that the footpath along the northern edge of the site be resurfaced and similarly upgraded.

During the debate the traffic flow at the train crossing was investigated further, however John Pateman-Gee, the Senior Management Development Officer reminded Members they were required to determine the application before them. He said in terms of the junction the causes of the traffic were also likely from the nearby commercial interests and limit these with traffic restriction could have an impact on the village in economic terms.

Members generally found the application satisfactory but requested that the addition of a Construction Management Plan and Archaeology conditions be added to the recommendations.

By 6 votes to 0 with 1 abstention

Decision –

- (1) That the Professional Lead - Growth and Sustainable Planning be authorised to secure a Planning Obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990, to provide:
 - Affordable Housing – 35%
 - Bust stop improvements £25,000
- (2) That, subject to the completion of the Planning Obligation in Resolution (1) above to the satisfaction of the Solicitor to the Council, the Professional Lead - Growth and Sustainable Planning be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the following conditions including:
 - Standard Time limit
 - Approval of Reserved Matters
 - Details of the estate roads and footpaths, (including layout, levels, gradients, surfacing and means of surface water drainage) and improvements to Footpath No 10
 - Highways condition- Visibility splays
 - Concurrent with Reserved Matters - Parking provision
 - Concurrent with Reserved Matters - Soft Landscaping scheme to be agreed including trees to be retained/removed and protection measures

- Concurrent with Reserved Matters- Provision and future management of Public Open Space
- Surface Water Drainage to be agreed
- Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan
- Provision of Fire Hydrants to be agreed
- Concurrent with Reserved Matters - Waste Strategy
- Acoustic glazing specification
- No burning of waste during clearance of site or construction
- Sustainability/Renewable as appropriate
- Ecology (in accordance with recommendations of Ecology Report)
- Addition of Construction Plan management
- Archaeology conditions as recommended by Suffolk County Council

(3) That, in the event of the Planning Obligation referred to in Resolution (1) above not being secured, the Professional Lead - Growth and Sustainable Planning be authorised to refuse planning permission, for reason(s) including:

- Failure to provide the requirements listed in (1), above contrary to Policy H4 of the Mid Suffolk Local Plan Alteration 2006 policy

The business of the Committee concluded at 12.10 p.m.

.....
Chairman