

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE 'A'** held at the Council Offices, Needham Market on Wednesday 12 October 2016 at 9:30am.

PRESENT: Councillor: Matthew Hicks (Chairman)
Roy Barker *
David Burn
John Field
Lavinia Hadingham
Diana Kearsley
Anne Killett
Sarah Mansel
Lesley Mayes
David Whybrow

Denotes substitute *

Ward Members: Councillor: Wendy Marchant
Mike Norris
Andrew Stringer

In Attendance: Professional Lead (Growth and Sustainable Planning)
Senior Development Management Planning Officer (JPG)
Development Management Planning Officer AS/LW)
Senior Legal Executive (KB)
Governance Support Officers (VL/GB)

NA91 APOLOGIES/SUBSTITUTIONS

Councillor Roy Barker was substituting for Councillor Gerard Brewster.

NA92 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Roy Barker declared a non-pecuniary interest in Applications 2902/16 and 2903/16 as he knew the family and occasionally used the public house.

Councillor David Whybrow declared a non-pecuniary interest in Application 2211/16 as he had a business interest with the previous site owner, and Applications 2902/16 and 2903/16 as an occasional user of the public house.

NA93 DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING

It was noted that Members had been lobbied on Applications 2902/16 and 2903/16.

NA94 DECLARATIONS OF PERSONAL SITE VISITS

There were no declarations of personal site visits.

NA95 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 17 AUGUST 2016

Report NA/19/16

The Minutes of the meeting held on 17 August 2016 were confirmed as a correct record.

NA96 PETITIONS

None received.

NA97 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS

None received.

NA98 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Report NA/20/16

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

Planning Number	Application	Representations from
2211/16		Michael Exley (Parish Council)
2022/16		David Jones
		Richard Brown (Agent)
2902/16		Martin Spurling (Town Council)
		Patricia Jackman (Objector)
		Heather Smith (Objector)
		Mr Williamson (Applicant)
2903/16		

Item 1

Application Number: **2211/16**
Proposal: Application for approval of reserved matters pursuant to outline planning permission, being part of hybrid planning application 0254/15, 'Hybrid planning application that seeks (a) Outline planning permission for demolition of all existing buildings and erection of 56 dwellings (including six affordable units) with associated parking, hardstanding and creation of public footway, with all matters reserved except access (b) Full planning permission for provision of open space (as shown on drawing no 16-23-03) relating to Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for the development
Site Location: **MENDLESHAM** – G R Warehousing Ltd, Old Station Road IP14 5RT
Applicant: Mr I King

The Development Management Planning Officer drew Members' attention to a revised comment from the SCC Landscape Planning Officer in the tabled papers and also responded to questions regarding parking provision, road widths and demolition works, including asbestos removal.

Michael Exley, speaking for the Parish Council, said that although there was support for the development there were still two areas of concern: landscaping and the setting of the listed building. It was important to retain the rural approach to the development and the removal of the hedging on the eastern boundary was unnecessary and should be left intact. Effective screening of Elms Farm was also required and although the trees and hedging were to be supplemented there was concern that new owners could remove this and he asked that the mature trees be protected by Tree Preservation Orders (TPO) and a minimum height for the hedging be conditioned.

Councillor Andrew Stringer, Ward Member, advised that both he and the Parish Council agreed this was the most sustainable site for development in the village. He said that although he supported the proposal it was important that the following conditions were included in any approval: 'No street lighting' as this would impact on the rural nature of the area; 'Garages to be used for parking of vehicles only' to prevent on street parking problems; and 'Construction traffic to enter and exit the site from the south only' to prevent HGVs from travelling through the village. He also felt that TPOs should be placed on the trees as suggested by the Parish Council.

Following consideration of the application and representations Members' found the application satisfactory but agreed that the suggested conditions regarding retention of garages for parking and routing of construction traffic should be included. An advisory note to the MSDC Tree Officer requesting

that immediate consideration be given to placing TPOs on the suggested mature trees was also requested.

By a unanimous vote

Decision – That authority be delegated to the Professional Lead (Growth and Sustainable Planning) to approve the Reserved Matters (Appearance, Landscape, Scale and Layout) subject to the following conditions:

- Accord with approved plans and documents
- Garages shall be for functional vehicular use only (in addition to conditions on the outline permission)
- Routing of construction traffic to be agreed

Advisory note: MSDC Tree Officer to give consideration to placing Tree Preservation Orders on mature trees

Item 2

Application Number: **2022/16**
Proposal: An outline planning application (with all matters reserved except access) for up to 130 dwellings and includes affordable housing, car parking, open space provision with associated infrastructure
Site Location: **GREAT BLAKENHAM** – Land on the west side of Stowmarket Road
Applicant: Christchurch Land and Estates (Great Blakenham)

Members' attention was drawn to the amended recommendation in the tabled papers and the Development Management Planning Officer responded to questions including existing development outside the settlement boundary, rear access to existing houses on Stowmarket Road, protection of green space, landscaping, housing mix and CIL payments.

David Jones, commenting on the application said he represented the allotment holders which bordered the site. Although it was now clear that the allotments were not included in the application site the holders had received a notification to quit so many were leaving. He asked that the position be clarified. Also, currently there were two access tracks to the allotments, one was overgrown and unusable and he asked for confirmation that the other would be left clear for vehicle access.

Richard Brown, the agent, advised that there had been pre-application discussions with planners and a public exhibition had been held to obtain community views. Reports confirmed the site was suitable for residential development and flood risk was not an issue. Although the site was outside the Settlement Boundary the proposal would contribute to the Council's land supply and the application was in accordance with policies.

Councillor Kevin Welsby, Ward Member commenting by email, said that Great Blakenham had grown considerably in recent years and it was

understandable that the community felt there was a lack of supporting infrastructure. Residents complained of lack of access to shops and doctor's surgery and that the village roads were inadequate. Although residents could use facilities at Claydon the road was bisected by a level crossing and subject to long delays. The route via the A14 was also heavily congested. Whilst supporting the application he asked that Suffolk County Council looked again at traffic issues and that any monies set aside for health were safeguarded for local surgeries.

Councillor John Field, Ward Member, said that the large increase in properties in a relatively small village had caused stress to the residents, most concerns related to the need for assurance that the necessary infrastructure would be provided. He agreed that it was a reasonable site for development but it was essential that the infrastructure was delivered and that the CIL monies were adequate.

It was noted that although initially included in the pre application discussion the allotments do not form part of the site and that an access track would remain.

Members found the application satisfactory and a motion for approval was proposed and seconded.

By a unanimous vote

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

- Affordable Housing 35%
- Travel Plan (Level to be agreed)

(2) That the Professional Lead – Growth and Sustainable Planning be authorised to grant Outline Planning Permission subject to conditions including:

- Outline Time Limit
- Submission of Reserved Matters
- Approved Plans
- Fire hydrants to be agreed (see page 121)
- Surface water to be agreed (Anglian Water page 128 and SUDS)
- Land Contamination Strategy to be agreed (see page 99)
- Noise survey (concurrent with Reserved Matters) (see page 98)
- Street lighting scheme to be agreed (Natural England page 117)
- Highway conditions (SCC pages 104 to 105 only)
- Arboricultural Method Statement
- Landscape conditions (pages 102 to 103)
- Removal of permitted development for extensions
- Ecological enhancements to be agreed

Item 3

Application Number: **2902/16**
Proposal: Erection of extension to the rear elevation, to provide additional dining and café space. Alteration to rear projection
Site Location: **NEEDHAM MARKET** – Rampant Horse Inn, Coddendam Road IP6 8AU
Applicant: Mr Williamson

The Development Management Planning Officer drew Members' attention to a recommended additional condition in the tabled papers and clarified land ownership of 1 Coddendam Road and rear access to that property.

Martin Spurling, speaking for the Town Council, said that when support was first expressed for the proposal it had not been understood that the development extended beyond the curtilage of the public house. The extension into the garden of 1 Coddendam Road would severely adversely impact on the residents living in the adjoining properties by reason of noise, light, overlooking and odours.

Patricia Jackman and Heather Smith shared the three minute speaking time for objectors.

Patricia Jackman, resident at 3 Coddendam Road said she believed it would be torment to live within a few feet of a commercial kitchen, which would happen if the proposed extension was allowed. The extension was overbearing, the windows would cause a loss of privacy, the extractor fan would be noisy and intrusive and there would be a loss of enjoyment of use of the garden. She was also concerned about security if there was a gate from the public house car park to the garden of 1 Coddendam Road.

Heather Smith said the plans did not clearly show the impact of a commercial kitchen on neighbouring properties. The proposed position of the kitchen ensured that the disruptive impact would be on the neighbouring properties and not the customers. The extension was three feet away from the adjacent property at its closest point and would impact on all the adjacent houses. The increased customer seating would also increase the number of vehicles needing to park which was likely to result in parking on the High Street and Coddendam Road impacting on residents.

Alec Williamson, the applicant, said that the extension was needed to provide café style seating and an improved kitchen and to ensure the long term viability of the premises. If approved it would improve the working environment, provide the highest standard of food and safety arrangements and increase employment. He had liaised with Officers to ensure there was no harm to the heritage asset and had made amendments to the proposal to address some points raised. The concerns regarding noise and odour could be addressed.

Councillor Wendy Marchant, Ward Member, said she was in favour of economic growth and creation of jobs but not at the expense of an overbearing development to the detriment of neighbour amenity. Although the proposed frontage alterations were attractive the proximity of the rear extension to neighbours was an issue. The enormous brick wall was much closer to the neighbouring property and the gable end was 1m higher. The large industrial extractor fan would cause noise and odour pollution to neighbours and the kitchen windows would cause overlooking. She reiterated the policy reasons for refusal quoted in the Ward Members' referral to Committee (page 142 of the agenda).

Councillor Mike Norris, Ward Member, supported the Town Council revised recommendation for refusal and Councillor Marchant's comments. The extension would have an overbearing effect on the cottages in Coddenham Road, which were listed buildings and in a Conservation Area. The scale and mass of the two storey element and the proposed roof material were out of keeping with the surroundings and the proposed extractor flue would be visible from some distance. The flue would also adversely impact on neighbours.

Member opinion was divided with some considering the application to be acceptable and others concerned regarding the impact on neighbouring properties. A motion for approval was seconded but withdrawn.

Subsequently, a motion for a site inspection to be held in order for Members to assess the impact of was proposed and seconded.

By 7 votes to 2 with 1 abstention

Decision – Defer for site inspection

Item 4

Application Number: **2903/16**
Proposal: Erection of extension to the rear elevation to provide additional dining and café space. Alterations to and internal reconfiguration of existing rear
Site Location: **NEEDHAM MARKET** – Rampant Horse Inn, Coddenham Road IP6 8AU
Applicant: Mr Williamson

Decision – Deferred to post site inspection meeting on 19 October 2016 meeting

NA99 SITE INSPECTION

The site inspection meeting in respect of Application 2902/16 would take place at 10:45am on Wednesday 19 December.

Chairman