

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE B** held at the Council Offices, Needham Market on 8 June 2016 at 09:30 am

PRESENT: Councillor Kathie Guthrie – Chairman – Conservative and Independent Group
Councillor Roy Barker – Vice-Chairman – Conservative and Independent Group

Conservative and Independent Group

Councillor: Julie Flatman
Derrick Haley *
Barry Humphreys MBE
John Levantis
Dave Muller
Jane Storey

Green Group

Councillor: Keith Welham

Liberal Democrat Group

Councillor: Mike Norris

Denotes substitute *

Ward Members: Lavinia Hadingham

In attendance: Senior Development Management Planning Officer (JPG)
Planning Officer (LW)
Enabling Officer – Heritage (PH)
Senior Legal Executive
Governance Support Officer (VL/KD)

SA80 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE/SUBSTITUTIONS

Councillor Derrick Haley was substituting for Councillor Jessica Fleming.

SA81 DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY/NON-PECUNIARY INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

SA82 DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING

It was noted that Members had been lobbied on Application 3282/15.

SA83 DECLARATIONS OF PERSONAL SITE VISITS

There were no declarations of personal site visits.

SA84 TO RECEIVE NOTIFICATION OF PETITIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COUNCIL'S PETITION PROCEDURE

None received.

SA85 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS

None received.

SA86 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Application Number	Representations from
3282/15	Malcolm Roberts (Parish Council) Kenneth Rowbottom (Supporter) Richard Sykes-Popham (Agent)

Item 1

Application	3282/15
Proposal	Application for Outline Planning Permission for the erection of a detached bungalow
Site Location	FRESSINGFIELD – The Cottage, Church Street IP21 5PA
Applicant	Mr O Wyper

Malcolm Roberts, advised that the Parish Council had voted unanimously to approve the application with the proviso that the dwelling's architectural appearance be amended to better fit the Conservation Area and that the applicant was committed to bringing forward a Reserved Matters application to do so. The Heritage Officer said that the approach to the village would be blighted by the proposal but there were already buildings on the opposite side of the road that did not preserve the medieval approach. Two dwellings had recently been approved in the Conservation Area and both with the potential to affect the setting of a listed building in the same way this application was claimed to. He felt the recommendation for refusal of this proposal demonstrated an inconsistent approach and that permission should be granted.

Kenneth Rowbottom, a supporter said that he had lived in the Conservation Area of the village for over 18 years and knew the area well. The applicant lived in one of the best maintained properties in the village and much thought and effort had been put into this application, which was not a frivolous proposal. The plans paid due attention to being in a Conservation Area and it was a very good application with a sound basis.

Richard Sykes-Popham, the Agent noted the strong community support for the application. He said the Officer's report was framed in the negative and the proper weight had not been given to various factors. The recommendation for refusal was against the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) approach as the lack of a five-year land supply meant that such applications should be approved unless unacceptable harm was proven. There had been no scrutiny of the Heritage Officer's comments and he considered that they were flawed in that: the site was surrounded

by a high fence and not open; there was no evidence of the site forming part of the historic gateway to the village; and little notice had been given to existing buildings abutting the highway. No consideration had been given to the benefits of the scheme and no evidence presented of any sustainability assessment. There was a presumption in favour of sustainable development and the balance weighed in favour of permission which would allow a sensitively designed dwelling to be brought forward.

Councillor Lavinia Hadingham, Ward Member said she disagreed with the Officer's conclusions and recommendation. Fressingfield was a primary village, the site was within the Settlement Boundary and there was support from both the Parish Council and wider community. The applicant wished to move to a smaller property but stay in this lovely spot and intended to build the property for themselves. There were holes in the Heritage Officer's arguments as there were many houses built abutting the pavement, many of which were not picturesque. It was an ordinary part of the village and there was no threat to the heritage of the village by approving the application.

Member opinion was divided. Some Members considered that there was a need for lifetime homes such as this and that a dwelling would not cause unacceptable harm to the Conservation Area. It was felt that as this was an outline application a more sympathetic design could be brought forward at Reserved Matters stage. Consideration should also be given to the Parish Council and community support. A motion for approval was drawn by five votes to five and lost on the Chairman's casting vote.

Others felt that the application did not satisfactorily demonstrate that a dwelling with safe access/egress could be built on the site. Further, to grant this application permission would restrict any proposed dwelling to a bungalow, limiting any design amendments to be brought forward at Reserved Matters stage. A motion for refusal was drawn by five votes to five.

By the Chairman's casting vote

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

The proposed development of this undeveloped green space would diminish its contribution to both the setting of the listed buildings and the wider Fressingfield Conservation Area. The infill development results in a contrived and seemingly unnatural evolution of development in this sensitive location. The proposal as such would cause unacceptable harm to designated heritage assets and the Fressingfield Conservation Area.

As such the proposal would be contrary to the NPPF, Local Plan Policies GP1, HB1, HB8, Core Strategy Policy CS5, Policies FC1 and FC1.1 of the Core Strategy Focused Review

.....
Chairman