SA/02/16

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

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

PRESENT: Councillor: Kathie Guthrie – Chairman

Councillors:	Roy Barker	Matthew Hicks
	David Burn	John Levantis
	John Field	Sarah Mansel
	Julie Flatman	Mike Norris
	Jessica Fleming	Jane Storey
	Lavinia Hadingham	David Whybrow

Ward Member: Councillor: Keith Welham

In attendance: Corporate Manager – Development Management (PI)
Development Control Officer (LE)
Senior Legal Executive (KB)
Governance Support Officer (VL/KD)

RF33 APOLOGIES/SUBSTITUTIONS

An apology for absence was received from Councillors Gerard Brewster, Glen Horn, Barry Humphreys, Diana Kearsley, Lesley Mayes and Dave Muller.

RF34 DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY OR NON-PECUNIARY INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

RF35 DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING

There were no declarations.

RF36 DECLARATIONS OF PERSONAL SITE VISITS

It was noted that Councillors Roy Barker, Julie Flatman, Matthew Hicks, Sarah Mansel and David Whybrow had undertaken personal site visits.

RF37 APPLICATION 3112/15

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

Planning Application Number	Representations From
3112/15	Jerry Voden (Parish Council) Jackie Ward (Objector)

	Application Number: 3112/15
Proposal:	Outline application for residential development of up to 175 dwellings with access, landscape, open space and associated infrastructure. All matters to be reserved with the exception of the main site access.
Site Location:	STOWUPLAND – Land between Gipping Road and Church Road
Applicant:	Gladman Developments 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

Members were advised that reason 6 in the recommendation should be amended to read Para.103 of the NPPF and not Para.7.

Jerry Voden, speaking for the Parish Council, said that the application had been discussed at length and the Parish Council was firmly opposed to it for the reasons stated in the consultation response. Hundreds of residents had expressed views with the majority opposed to the proposal as being too large and in the wrong location. The adverse impacts far outweighed any benefits and the proposed development did not meet the aims of the Core Strategy or Stowmarket Area Action Plan. Good progress was being made on a Neighbourhood Plan for the village which showed support for small developments to meet local needs. He asked that the Committee reject the application and give residents the opportunity of development to meet the needs of the community.

Jackie Ward, an objector advised Members that she was speaking on behalf of nearly 250 residents. She said that although the community had always welcomed new people, this development was too much for the village and would overwhelm services and amenities and was unsustainable. All traffic would travel through the village and there were serious concerns regarding the adverse impact the additional vehicles would have on safety. There was only one narrow footway on Church Road and none on Gipping Road which was likely to become a rat run for those avoiding the already busy Church Road. The traffic studies had also been carried out prior to the schools reorganisation and took no account of the increase in traffic that would be caused by either this or of the planned development at Mill Lane. The proposal did not meet the needs of the village for affordable housing. If approved the development would change the character of the village making it urban with the scar of new roads, houses and lights. The friendly, family village atmosphere would be obliterated.

Councillor Keith Welham, Ward Member, said that of 250 representations received only one was in support. The site was an open rural area, with views to the church and Visually Important Open Space and well-trodden footpaths. The site was a green corridor from the school playing fields which would be blighted by houses, traffic and street lights if the application was approved. The local concerns regarding traffic impact had also been raised by the Highways

Authority, and the applicant had in fact estimated that when the houses were occupied one junction would be to capacity without the additional increase that would be caused by the schools reorganisation. Due to this lack of reliable traffic data the Highways Authority was unable to recommend what infrastructure was required to deal with the increase in vehicles. One local health centre was already at capacity and it was likely that the other would be unable to cope with the increased demand; the shortage of available school places was also a concern. Residents of the new dwellings would rely on cars for daily shopping and there would be no economic benefit to the village. The proposed development was too large and in the wrong place. He asked that Stowupland be given the opportunity to complete its Neighbourhood Plan and to steer development to areas where it could be accommodated.

Note: Councillor Welham left the Council Chamber after making his presentation and did not return until after consideration of the item and vote thereon had taken place

Members considered that the application showed fundamental errors and contained inadequate information in various areas including heritage appraisal and potential flood risk. Concerns were expressed regarding:

- The lack of engagement with the community and planning authority
- Impact on the listed building, Columbyne Hall
- Sustainability of the development – economically and socially
- Impact on the characteristics of the settlement
- Traffic impacts on Church Road
- Increased congestion at school times
- Lack of information regarding the access/egress on Gipping Road
- Insufficient S106 contributions to improve facilities eg health/education

The Committee fully supported the Officer recommendation and a motion for refusal was proposed and seconded.

By a unanimous vote

Decision – That Outline Planning Permission be refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposal, by reason of its scale and form, would have a detrimental impact on the landscape character of the area including an area designated Visually Important Open Space in the adopted Development Plan, and would not conserve or enhance local distinctiveness or safeguard the appreciation of that landscape for users of the Public Right of Way network in the area. As such, the proposal conflicts with the aims of paras. 61, 76 and 109 of the NPPF, Policy CS5 of the adopted Core Strategy (2008), Policy FC1.1 of the Focused Review of that Document, Policy 4.2 of the Stowmarket Area Action Plan (2013) and saved Policy RT12 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Local Plan (1998)

2. The application as submitted fails to demonstrate that the development would not have a detrimental effect on highway safety, with particular reference to the junction of the A1120 and B1115 at the eastern edge of Stowupland, contrary to the aims of para. 35 of the NPPF, Policies FC1

and FC1.1 of the Core Strategy Focused Review (2012), Policies 4.1 and 8.1 of the Stowmarket Area Action Plan (2013) and saved Policy T10 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Local Plan (1998)

3. The proposed development would have detrimental impact on biodiversity due to the loss of hedgerows of high ecological importance contrary to Paras. 109 and 118 of the NPPF, Policy CS5 of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy, Policy FC1 of the Core Strategy Focused Review and saved Policy CL8 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Local Plan (1998)

4. The proposed development by virtue of its scale and form would have a detrimental impact on the setting of heritage assets, including the cluster of Grade II listed buildings on Church Road and the Grade II* listed Columbine Hall. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Paras. 131, 132 and 134 of the NPPF. Policy CS5 of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy, Policy 9.5 of the Stowmarket Area Action Plan, Policy FC1.1 of the Core Strategy Focused Review and saved Policy HB1 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Local Plan (1998)

5. The proposal fails to make adequate provision/contributions (and/or agreement to provide) for community and other facilities/services for the occupants of the dwellings. The applicants have not entered in to the necessary legal agreement, which is required to ensure the following Community Infrastructure Requirements/Facilities are provided:
   - The provision of 35% of the dwellings as onside Affordable Housing,
   - **Financial contributions towards Primary School and Secondary School Places, Pre-school Places, Libraries and Waste.**
   - Financial contributions towards Highway Improvements and a Traffic Regulation Order in order to address highway and pedestrian safety concerns and improvements to the Public Right of Way network.
   - The provision of Play Space and Sports Space and Social Infrastructure
   - A Management Plan to deal with the provision, maintenance and transfer of open space and play space equipment.

   The Proposal is therefore contrary to the NPPF, saved Policy CS6 of the adopted Core Strategy, Policy FC1.1 of the Focused Review, Policy 11.1 of the Stowmarket Area Action Plan (2013) and saved Altered Policy H4 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Local Plan First Alteration

6. The application as submitted fails to demonstrate that the proposed development would not cause localised flooding through the identification of flood risk or adequate mitigation measures compliant with national or local standards. Furthermore it does not clearly describe the existing drainage system or fully describe sustainable drainage solutions for the development. As such the proposal conflicts with the aims of Para. 103 of the NPPF and Para. 1D7 of the associated Practice Guidance, Policy CS4 of the adopted Core Strategy, Policies FC1 and FC1.1 of the Focussed Review (2012) and Policy 4.1 of the Stowmarket Area Action Plan (2013)