

**MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Minutes of the **PLANNING REFERRALS COMMITTEE** held at the Council Offices, Needham Market on Wednesday 8 June 2016 at 2:30pm

**PRESENT:** Councillor: Matthew Hicks – Chairman

Councillors:	Gerard Brewster	Barry Humphreys MBE
	David Burn	John Levantis
	John Field	Sarah Mansel
	Julie Flatman	Dave Muller
	Jessica Fleming	Mike Norris
	Kathie Guthrie	Jane Storey
	Lavinia Hadingham	Keith Welham

**Ward Member:** Councillor: Charles Flatman

**In attendance:** Corporate Manager – Development Management (PI)  
Senior Planning Officer (SS)  
Senior Legal Executive (KB)  
Corporate Manager (Strategic Housing)  
Corporate Manager (Community and Heritage)  
Economic Development Officer (DE)  
Governance Support Officer (VL/KD)

**RF01 APOLOGIES/SUBSTITUTIONS**

An apology for absence was received from Councillors Roy Barker, Diana Kearsley, Lesley Mayes and David Whybrow.

**RF02 DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY OR NON-PECUNIARY INTEREST**

Councillor Lavinia Hadingham declared a non-pecuniary interest as she knew the applicant socially.

Councillor Gerard Brewster declared a non-pecuniary interest as Portfolio Holder for the growth agenda.

**RF03 DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING**

It was noted that Councillor Kathie Guthrie had been lobbied on Application 3563/15.

**RF04 DECLARATIONS OF PERSONAL SITE VISITS**

It was noted that Councillors David Burn, Gerard Brewster, Jessica Fleming and Mike Norris had undertaken a personal site visit.

## **RF05 LAND TO THE SOUTH OF EYE AIRFIELD: DEVELOPMENT BRIEF**

### **Report RF/02/16 Corporate Manager (Community Planning (Heritage and Design))**

The report set out the provisions of a Development Brief that had been prepared and submitted for land to the south of Eye Airfield. The land had been identified for housing purposes by the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy and Core Strategy Focused Review and other planning documents produced to guide the development of Eye Airfield.

Councillors were requested to note that the document would subsequently be used to guide the consideration of future planning applications in line with the Development Plan and other material considerations.

Officers advised Members that there were amendments to the Recommendation 2.1 in the report, as follows:

‘That, the content of the Land to the South of Eye Airfield Development Brief and Addendum be noted as an informal planning document that will be used with immediate effect to guide the consideration of future applications on the site.’

Members questioned Officers and sought clarity on sustainability and planning for the future, in particular lowering carbon footprints. Members were advised that this report set out broad principles and aspirations for the site; detail for items such as environmental sustainability would come forward in planning applications.

**Note:** Councillor Humphries left the Council Chamber and took no part in the vote for this item.

By 13 votes to 1.

#### **RESOLUTION 1**

*That, the content of the Land to the South of Eye Airfield Development Brief and Addendum be noted as an informal planning document that will be used with immediate effect to guide the consideration of future applications on the site.*

#### **RESOLUTION 2**

*That, without prejudice to the formal consideration of the related planning application for the development of the site, the Planning Referrals Committee gives careful consideration to the completion of a planning obligation to ensure that future applications on the site are substantially in accordance with the provisions of the Development Brief and addendum to the Design and Access Statement*

## RF06 APPLICATION 3563/15

### Report RF/01/16

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

Planning Application Number	Representations From
3563/15	Peter Gould (Town Council) Robert Barber (Applicant)
Proposal:	Application Number: 3563/15 Outline planning permission sought for a proposed development comprising up to 280 dwellings; a 60 bed residential care home, the re-provision of a car park for the use of Mulberry Bush Nursery; re-location of existing farm buildings to the west of Parcel 15; and associated infrastructure including roads (including adaptations to Castleton Way and Langton Grove) pedestrian, cycle and vehicle routes, parking, drainage, open spaces, landscaping, utilities and associated earthworks.
Site Location:	EYE – Land at Eye Airfield, Castleton Way
Applicant:	Mr Baldwin

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

Members were advised that Recommendation 1, bullet point 3 should be amended to:

'That subsequent applications for the development of the site should be substantially in accordance with the provisions of the development brief and addendum (and design and access statement addendum).'

It was noted that the applicant was Mr Baldwin, as per the Officer report.

Peter Gould, speaking for the Town Council, said that they understood that economic and housing growth was essential for Eye to have a sustainable future, and he advised that the Town Council had engaged fully in early place shaping discussions. Their requirements were clear and simple:

- The development should be in keeping with the town
- Improvements to current roads and junctions were required
- Existing drainage problems in the town needed to be addressed
- Education and health provision to be increased

He advised that as this was an outline application the Town Council felt unprotected from a higher density, low quality development. The Town Council

felt that there had been inadequate public consultation and engagement following the inclusion of the care home in the development, and there was concern that there was no proof of need particularly in view of the closeness of the existing care home.

Robert Barber, the applicant advised Members that this outline application was the culmination of several years' hard work. The development scheme had been subject to intensive and sustained consultation, and concerns raised during the public consultation, such as drainage, had been taken into account and addressed. He made Members aware that the care home was referred to during the consultations that were carried out.

In response to Members questions, he clarified that during the original place shaping meetings, a care home was discussed, and it was an aspiration to deliver this. Due to an aging demographic the 60 bed care home was to meet future needs.

Councillor Charles Flatman, Ward Member, spoke against the application and advised the Committee that the application went against the will of the people of Eye. He expressed his thanks to Suffolk Preservation Society and the Town Council for reflecting the town's views. He advised the Committee that the people of Eye were not opposed to development, just the vast amount of housing in the proposal. The site was a greenfield site that absorbed much of the rainfall, if this was to be developed and became hardstanding for houses it would exacerbate the drainage issue. If this development went forward the contour of the town would be lost.

Members discussed the application at length and clarified various issues with the Officers present, including concerns surrounding:

- Traffic and parking issues
- Single access road to the site
- Environmental sustainability
- Size of care home and inclusion in the proposal
- Concern that outline plans could change

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

**Note:** Councillor Humphries left the Council Chamber and did not return.

By a 13 votes to 1

**Decision** – That the Planning 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:-

- (1) Provision and management of public open space/play equipment;
  - Affordable Housing as agreed (20%);
  - That subsequent planning applications for the development of the site should be substantially in accordance with the provisions of the development brief and addendum (and design and access

statement addendum);

- Travel Plan details and provision, as agreed with SCC;
- Education - £1,768,253
- Pre-school provision - £170,548
- Libraries - £60,480
- NHS England - £100,380
- Highway Safety Improvements (Town Centre, Primary and High Schools) - £75,000;
- Public transport - £37,000;
- Rights of way - £45,150;
- Sports facilities/pitch drainage in Eye - £100,000

- (2) That, subject to the completion of the Planning Obligation in Resolution (1) above, the Planning Lead – Growth and Sustainable Planning be authorised to grant Planning Permission subject to conditions including:-

#### General

- Time limit for reserved matters (standard)
- Definition of reserved matters
- Approved plans; red-lined SLP and masterplan (only in so far as relating to access)
- Quantum of residential development fixed to a maximum of 280 no. dwellings
- Maximum height of care home to be two storeys
- Development to be completed in accordance with ecology details
- Piling of any other foundation designs using penetrative methods shall not be permitted, unless otherwise agreed.

#### Prior to commencement/installation (where relevant)

- External lighting/illumination details
- Archaeology WSI/Assessment
- Waste management/recycling details
- Foul and surface water drainage details
- Arboricultural method statement/tree protection details
- Landscape management plan
- Fire hydrant provision details
- Construction management plan
- Land contamination strategy, investigation and remediation (if necessary)
- Land contamination monitoring and maintenance plan
- Provision of alternative habitat for Skylarks

#### Concurrently with Reserved Matters

- Phasing details (inc. trigger points for each successive phase)
- Proposed levels and finished floor levels details
- External facing materials details
- Energy efficiency/BREEAM details
- Hard landscaping scheme (inc. boundary treatments and

- screen/fencing details)
- Soft landscaping scheme
- Emergency access treatment/management details
- Refuse bin details

### Highways

- Parking, manoeuvring, and cycle storage details
  - Parking to be in accordance with adopted standards
  - Roundabout access details
  - School drop-off and zebra crossing details
  - Surface water discharge prevention details
  - Estate roads and footpaths details and implementation requirements
  - HGV/deliveries management plan
- (3) That, in the event of the Planning Obligation referred to in Resolution (1) above not being secured the Planning Lead – Growth and Sustainable Planning be authorised to refuse Planning Permission, for reason(s) including:-
- Inadequate provision of infrastructure contributions which would fail to provide compensatory benefits to the sustainability of the development and its wider impacts, contrary to the development plan and national planning policy.

## **RF07 FOOD ENTERPRISE ZONES**

**Report RF/0316**  
**Officer (DE)**

**Economic**

**Development**

The report requested Member approval for the Public Consultation on the Local Development order on the Stowmarket Enterprise Park (Gipping Food Enterprise Zone, Stowmarket).

The Economic Development Officer advised the Committee that there was a change to Recommendation 2.1 as follows:

‘That the Committee adopt the draft Local Development Order for the purposes of public consultation to run for a period of 28 days, in relation to the Local Development Order (LDO) for Stowmarket Enterprise Park.’

Members thanked all Officers involved for their work, and praised the report. The Officer responded to Members questions and clarified that the site would only have B class restriction. It was felt that this would bring employment benefit to the Stowmarket and Mid Suffolk area, with the food zone making this site more attractive to potential businesses.

**Note:** Councillors Jane Storey, Kathie Guthrie and Jessica Fleming left the Council Chamber and took no part in the vote for this item.

By a unanimous vote.

## **RESOLUTION**

*That the Committee adopt the draft Local Development Order for the purposes of public consultation to run for a period of 28 days, in relation to the Local Development Order (LDO) for Stowmarket Enterprise Park.*