

## MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE 'A'** held at the Council Offices, Needham Market on Wednesday 20 July 2016 at 9:30am.

**PRESENT:** Councillor: Matthew Hicks (Chairman)  
Roy Barker \*  
Gerard Brewster  
David Burn  
John Field  
Lavinia Hadingham  
Diana Kearsley  
John Matthissen \*  
Lesley Mayes  
Keith Welham \*

Denotes substitute \*

**Ward Members:** Councillor: Penny Otton

**In Attendance:** Professional Lead – Growth and Sustainable Planning  
Senior Planning Officer (GW)  
Development Management Planning Officer (SES)  
Senior Legal Executive (KB)  
Governance Support Officers (VL/KD)

### NA74 APOLOGIES/SUBSTITUTIONS

Councillors Roy Barker, John Matthissen and Keith Welham were substituting for Councillors David Whybrow, Anne Killett and Sarah Mansel respectively.

### NA75 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Gerard Brewster declared a non-pecuniary interest in application 0958/16 by way of being a Member of Stowmarket Town Council.

Councillor John Field declared a non-pecuniary interest in application 0722/16 by way of being a trustee of an agricultural organisation.

Councillor Roy Barker declared a non-pecuniary interest in application 0722/16 by way of having had crop trials carried out on his farm.

### NA76 DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING

Councillors Lavinia Hadingham, John Field, Matthew Hicks and David Burn had been lobbied on application 0958/16.

## **NA77 DECLARATIONS OF PERSONAL SITE VISITS**

Councillor Lesley Mayes advised she had walked past application site 0958/16, but had not been on it.

Councillor John Matthissen advised he knew site 0958/16 as it was a route he had cycled previously.

## **NA78 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 22 JUNE 2016**

### **Report NA/14/16**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 22 June 2016 were confirmed as a correct record.

## **NA79 MINUTES OF THE PLANNING REFERRALS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 8 JUNE 2016**

The Minutes of the Planning Referrals Committee meeting held on 8 June 2016 were confirmed as a correct record.

## **NA80 PETITIONS**

None received.

## **NA81 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS**

None received.

## **NA82 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

### **Report NA/16/16**

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

<b>Planning Number</b>	<b>Application</b>	<b>Representations from</b>
0958/16		Christina Connell (Objector) Sam Robinson (Applicant)
0722/16		Chris Netton (Agent) Daphne Youngs (Parish Council) Dr Clive Boyce (Objector) Iain Turner (Applicant)

Note: Application 2113/16 was withdrawn. Therefore the Council would no longer be determining the application, and it did not need to be heard at this Committee. The Professional Lead – Growth and Sustainable Planning requested that the Committee allow that a letter be sent to the Applicant's agent advising of the considerable time and cost the application had taken to report to Committee and to express disappointment that the application was withdrawn at such a late stage. Members agreed for this to be sent.

Item 1

Application Number: **0958/16**  
Proposal: Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of 22 no new dwellings with 18 no parking spaces to the rear. Creation of new vehicle access from Iliffe Way  
Site Location: **STOWMARKET** – 9 Finborough Road IP14 1PN  
Applicant: Havebury Housing Partnership

At the outset of the presentation on the application, the Case Officer drew Members' attention to the tabled late papers. Upon conclusion of the presentation, the Case Officer answered Members' questions including in relation to:

- Detail regarding how many of the dwellings in the proposal would be available to rent and how many would be available to buy.
- The position of the pedestrian crossing on Iliffe Way
- Whether the height and width of the undercroft could accommodate more than one vehicle passing or accept delivery vehicles.

Christina Connell, an objector, addressed the Committee and expressed concerns on behalf of residents living on Finborough Road. She advised that it was felt that the proposal was not in keeping with the surrounding area as the precedent for existing dwellings in this location was two storeys, not three. She said the proposal did not respect the scale and density of existing dwellings in the area. There was concern that extra vehicle movements from the development would exacerbate an existing traffic problem in this location, and there was further concern that there was no parking available for delivery vehicles. Whilst there was agreement that homes of this type were required in Stowmarket, this was not the place for them to be built.

Sam Robinson the agent, addressed the Committee and advised that he had been approached by Havebury Housing Partnership (HHP) to produce a viable scheme on the site, which was constrained by the existing trees, the pond and neighbouring dwellings. Due to location constraints there was reduced parking with the proposal, but it was a sustainable location with good public transport links, and would deliver wider benefits of much needed flats in this area. He confirmed that advice had been sought from the Highways authority regarding the provision of parking and the number of car parking spaces included with the proposal had been deemed acceptable.

In response to Members questions the agent and applicant, Chris Netton (for HHP) clarified other sites HHP had developed some of which had unallocated parking provision for residents and visitors. Parking on this site would be managed by HHP.

Lesley Mayes, Ward Member, addressed the Committee and advised concerns including those in relation to:

- The impact of the development on existing traffic issues on Iliffe Way and Finborough Road
- Height of the proposal, three storeys would be higher than all other houses in the vicinity
- No visitor parking had been included
- Concern over trees in close proximity to the proposed dwellings
- Where the pedestrian crossing on Iliffe Way would be moved to.

During the debate that followed, Members considered matters including:

- Limited availability of parking spaces for residents and visitors
- Traffic access/egress
- Tree positions and impact on maintenance of the dwellings; and pressure to prune the preserved trees and on residents
- The need and requirement locally for this type of housing
- Appearance, design and height of proposal
- Concern over construction traffic, and impact of this on neighbouring car parks

Having considered all representations, Members generally felt that the proposal was sustainable, although it would be prudent to add the following conditions in addition to those included in the officer's report and recommendation:

- ***Scheme of construction management TBA with objective to secure optimum parking of construction and contractor vehicles on site.***
- ***Tree protection measures during construction to include measures to safeguard trees from construction traffic & vehicle parking and materials storage during construction phase***
- ***Scheme for boundary fencing TBA***

By 8 votes to 1.

**Decision** – (1) Subject to the prior completion of a Section 106 Planning Obligation on appropriate terms to the satisfaction of the Professional Lead (Growth and Sustainable Planning) to secure:

- Affordable housing

That the Professional Lead (Growth and Sustainable Planning) be authorised to grant Full Planning Permission subject to those conditions included in the officer's report and recommendation including:

- Standard time limit
- Approved plans
- Implementation of surface water strategy prior to construction of hard standing
- Access completed in accordance with drawing and available for use prior to first occupation
- Prior to the commencement of development existing dropped kerbs and tactile paving on Iliffe Way relocated in accordance with details to be agreed
- New vehicular access surfaced with bound material
- Details to show means to prevent discharge of surface water onto the highway
- Any gates set back a minimum of 10m,
- Removal of permitted development rights such that access shall only be from Iliffe Way
- Parking and manoeuvring areas provided prior to first occupation
- Hard and soft landscaping details and implementation
- Biodiversity protection and enhancement measures
- Foundation design and no dig construction methods
- Details for leaf-drop measures
- Materials
- Construction working hours
- Levels to be agreed
- ***Scheme of construction management TBA with objective to secure optimum parking of construction and contractor vehicles on site.***

- ***Tree protection measures during construction to include measures to safeguard trees from construction traffic & vehicle parking and materials storage during construction phase***
- ***Scheme for boundary fencing TBA***

Item 2

Application Number: **2113/16**  
 Proposal: Erection of 27 dwellings including 9 affordable homes (following demolition of existing buildings)  
 Site Location: **BARHAM** – Land between Norwich Road and Pesthouse Lane  
 Applicant: Messrs K & P Moxon

This item was withdrawn.

Item 3

Application Number: **0722/16**  
 Proposal: Continued use of land and buildings as an operational base for agricultural research and development. Erection of storage building and cabin (following removal of existing structure)  
 Site Location: **DRINKSTONE** – Meade Farm Buildings, Beyton Road IP30 9SS  
 Applicant: Envirofield Ltd

At the outset of the presentation on the application, the Case Officer drew Members' attention to the tabled papers and the consultation response from Suffolk County Council Highways. Upon conclusion of the presentation, the Case Officer answered Members' questions including those in relation to:

- Activity opposite the site entrance
- Size of agricultural equipment and vehicles used by the applicant's business
- The tree seen to the left of the site entrance
- Nature of the business undertaken from the site

Daphne Youngs, speaking on behalf of the Parish Council, began by stating that it wished to support rural business however, legitimate problems with this application had not been addressed. Access to the site was an issue as it was down a single track road. Large vehicles struggled to manoeuvre in and out of the site. She also advised that there was no turning circle on the site, which added to the accessibility issue. If activity were to increase, then this issue would be exacerbated. The design of the office building was out of keeping with the rural agricultural area and was in full view of neighbouring properties. It was felt that this was a successful business that had outgrown its premises.

In response to Members' questions, she advised that the new site access was an improvement, but the road to access the site was too narrow to accommodate large vehicles.

Clive Boyce, speaking as an objector, advised the Committee that he was an immediate neighbour to the site, and represented the views of the other neighbours. It was felt that the scale and design of the application was wrong for the site as the materials were out of character, and were unsympathetic to the area and nearby residents. Access to the site was a concern as there were no passing places on the single track road. He felt that access for large vehicles was inadequate. He also voiced concern regarding volume of vehicle movements and burning of materials on site.

Iain Turner, the applicant, addressed the Committee to advise that there were no operational activities of crop trialling carried out onsite. The site was used for the storage and maintenance of equipment. He confirmed that smaller scale agricultural machinery was used, and this was small enough to be transported using a low loader vehicle.

In response to Members' questions he advised that all vehicle movements had been using the new site entrance, as he was keen to minimise impact on residents. He stated all their crop trials were carried out on commercial farms.

Penny Otton, Ward Member stated that there had been confusion over whether this application was agricultural or not. She advised she was concerned over the traffic and access issue, as the road leading to the site was extremely narrow. She believed that expansion of this business should take place elsewhere.

Members' opinion was divided, whilst some had sympathy with the concerns raised, others felt that this was an important rural business meeting a need for research in agriculture in a rural county.

After further debate the following conditions were included:

- Foul sewage TBA
- Vehicle washdown area TBA
- Scheme of access and visibility improvements inc timetable for improvement TBA
- Scheme of outside lighting TBA
- No external storage over 3m AGL
- No fires on site
- Materials and surfacing colouration of cabin building TBA

By 6 votes to 4.

**Decision** – That Full Planning Permission be granted subject to the conditions included in the officer's report and recommendation:

- Timescale for implementation
- Approved documents
- Landscaping scheme
- Timescale for landscaping
- Visibility splays as conditioned by SCC Highways
- Operating hours 8am – 6pm Monday to Friday and 8am – 1pm on Saturdays
- No commercial vehicle movements outside the above hours
- Clarification of surface and foul water drainage arrangements
- Restriction on use within Class B1
- Foul sewage TBA
- Vehicle washdown area TBA
- Scheme of access and visibility improvements inc timetable for improvement TBA
- Scheme of outside lighting TBA
- No external storage over 3m AGL
- No fires on site
- Materials and surfacing colouration of cabin building TBA

.....  
Chairman