

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, 17 May 2017

PRESENT:

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

In attendance: Senior Development Management Planning Officer (JPG)
Development Management Planning Officer (RB/LW)
Lawyer - Planning (IdP)
Governance Support Officer (VL/HH)

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE/SUBSTITUTIONS

There were no apologies received.

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

There were no declarations of interests received.

3 DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING

It was noted that Members had been lobbied on Application 4427/16 by email.

4 DECLARATIONS OF PERSONAL SITE VISITS

There were no declarations of personal site visits.

5 SA/10/17 CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 19 APRIL 2017

The minutes of the meeting held on 19 April 2017 were confirmed as a correct record with the following amendment:

Councillor Jane Storey declared a non-pecuniary interest in application 3469/16 in her capacity as Suffolk County Councillor for Elmswell and as an acquaintance of the landowner.

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

None received.

7 **QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC**

None received.

8 **QUESTIONS BY COUNCILLORS**

None received.

9 **SA/11/17 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

Schedule of Planning Applications

Application Number	Representations from
0156/17	Chris Smith (Agent)
4427/16	Martin Last (Agent)

Item 1

Application Proposal	0156/17 Application for approval of reserved matters pursuant to outline planning permission 2986/15 relating to Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for the development for the erection of 130 residential dwellings, garages, public open space and vehicular access
Site Location	BRAMFORD – Land adjacent to Bramford Playing Field, The Street IP8 4DJ
Applicant	Hopkins Homes Limited.

The officer pointed Members' attention to the tabled papers and to the amended Arboriculture Method Statement and floor level plans. The officer then presented the report and Members asked questions including:

- the size of the garages
- the arrangements for the management of the Parkland
- the site of the BMX track
- the management of surface water
- the planting scheme
- the cul-de-sac roads to the north of the site
- access for emergency vehicles

The officer informed Members of the plans for the parkland north of the site and explained the planting scheme bordering the parkland was intended to provide a transitional area to integrate the site into the rural setting. The parkland was to be an ecological site.

Chris Smith, the Agent, said the development had been designed to be in keeping with the existing area and to retain the rural setting in the village. This had been achieved by careful landscaping and a detailed Landscaping Management Plan was

provided. The development consisted of a mix of dwellings, including affordable housing. Mr Smith said that the two cul-de-sacs to the north of the site were designed for turning places for cars. He also said that there was a main gas line and high voltage pylons at the north end of the plot, and that there were no intentions of developing the parkland.

In response to Members' questions Mr Smith said that the development could commence once the permission had been granted. He explained that chimneys were for aesthetic purposes only and that the houses complied with the National Standard Building Regulations with respect to energy saving measures.

Councillor John Field, Ward Member, was unable to attend the meeting but the Chairman read out an email received from him stating that the application was in an appropriate place, of reasonable scale and met the clear need for housing to support the growth of the local economy. He agreed generally with the layout and the proposed design of the dwellings, but encouraged Members to ensure the concerns of the Parish Council with regards to access to the playing field were respected. He also requested that the responsibility for maintenance of the open spaces was clearly defined.

Members agreed that the development was a good layout with a variety of house styles and a good mixture of dwellings including affordable housing.

By a unanimous vote

Decision – Approved – As recommendations (with reference to landscape removed from management plan)

That authority be delegated to Corporate Manager - Growth & Sustainable Planning to Grant Approval of the Reserved Matters subject to the prior agreement of a Landscape Management Plan and subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Accord with approved plans
- 2) Precise species mix and planting strategies to be provided prior to commencement and implemented in accordance with outline pp.
- 3) Landscape Management Plan to be provided and implemented
- 4) Elevations and materials for all boundary treatment

Item 2

Application	4427/16
Proposal	Erection of 8 flats and associated vehicular access and external works following demolition of existing dwelling.
Site Location	NEEDHAM MARKET – lion Barn House, Maitland Road IP6 8NZ
Applicant	Foregain Ltd.

The Officer presented the report and responded to Members questions. It was established that the site was a residential site and that the previously refused

proposal had been revised to a two story building with eight flats and eleven car parking spaces. A noise attenuation fence was to be erected to reduce the noise from the adjacent industrial estate.

Martin Last, the Agent, said that the reasons for refusal had been addressed. The property had been reduced from a three storey to a two storey building addressing the overlooking issue, and the number of flats had been reduced from eleven to eight. The issues of noise, smell and pollution had also been addressed. A noise attenuation fence was to be erected to reduce noise from the industrial estate. Mr Last said that the site was too small for an industrial development and that the existing house would either be rented or left vacant. He said only four objections had been received on the application and that the development was sustainable and would add to much needed housing for single or first time buyers.

Councillor Wendy Marchant, Ward Member, said the house on the site was originally Lion Barn Industrial Estate' caretakers house and that the development of eight flats so close to an industrial estate was likely to raise complaints from future residents living on the site which could adversely impact on the existing businesses. She also pointed out that the site was an island in an area that flooded. Councillor Marchant said that there were already 266 new dwellings planned or in the process of being built in Needham Market, therefore this site was not needed as provision for housing need. Councillor Marchant said that the Lion Estate was needed to provide job opportunities and that Needham Market Town Council objected to the application.

Councillor Mike Norris, Ward Member, agreed with Councillor Marchant and added that Lion Barn Industrial Estate provided employment opportunities and that it was important to retain employment in the area. Councillor Norris said that a new residential development in close proximity to an established industrial estate was likely to cause complaints from residents. The issue of the existing dwellings being overlooked by the new development was still a problem. He said that the flooding of the access roads to the site would be a problem. He said, he felt that there was no specific housing need in Needham Market as there were already a large number of developments planned.

Members asked questions and it was clarified that:

- Needham Market's Neighbourhood Plan was at an early stage and that development sites had not been allocated yet.
- There were no restrictions on the Lion Barn Industrial Estate and that businesses could operate 24/7.
- Four residents and the businesses on the Lion Barn Industrial Estate had objected

Members debated the use of the site and whether reasons for refusal had been rectified along with all other material planning considerations. Members considered if there was a risk of complaints from residents of the development due to the close proximity to the Lion Barn Industrial Estate this could impact on the businesses and the local economy. Equally the industrial uses were likely to have a detrimental

impact on the new development. It was generally felt that the reasons for refusal had not been addressed on these issues and that residential use of the site would affect and restrict the commercial use of the Lion Barn Industrial Estate. The previous issue on overlooking was not upheld as this was considered to be addressed.

By 6 votes to 1 with 1 abstention

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

The proposed development, by reason of its close relationship to an existing unrestricted industrial and commercial area, is considered contrary to Policy H17 of the Mid Suffolk Local Plan 1998 which details that residential development will be refused in areas subject to excessive road traffic noise, noise, smell or other forms of pollution from industrial premises. Furthermore the proposed intensification of residential development would act as an unnecessary form of restriction on the industrial and commercial use which would affect the viability of these existing uses contrary to Policy E4 of the Mid Suffolk Local Plan 1998. The development is also considered contrary to paragraphs 120 and 123 of the National Planning Policy Framework which provides that new development should be appropriate for its location, should not place unreasonable restrictions on existing businesses and prevent risks from pollution.

The business of the meeting concluded at 11:35 am.

.....
Chairman