

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of the **MID SUFFOLK PLANNING REFERRALS COMMITTEE** held at the Council Chamber - Council Offices, Needham Market on Wednesday, 26 July 2017

PRESENT:

Councillor Kathie Guthrie – Chairman

Councillors:	Gerard Brewster	Michael Burke
	David Burn	John Field
	Julie Flatman	Jessica Fleming
	Lavinia Hadingham	Barry Humphreys MBE
	Diana Kearsley	Anne Killett
	Sarah Mansel	Wendy Marchant
	Jane Storey	Keith Welham
	David Whybrow	

In attendance:

Corporate Manager – Planning and Sustainable Growth
Planning Officer (SB)
Legal Business Partner (IdeP)
Matt Hullis, Suffolk County Council SUDS Officer
Assistant Director – Governance and Law
Governance Support Officer (VL/RC)

32 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE/SUBSTITUTIONS**

An apology for absence was received from Councillors Roy Barker, Lesley Mayes and Matthew Hicks

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

There were no declarations of interest.

34 **DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING**

It was noted that Members had been lobbied on the application.

35 **DECLARATIONS OF PERSONAL SITE VISITS**

Councillors David Whybrow, Lavinia Hadingham, Michael Burke and Sarah Mansel declared they had undertaken a personal site visit.

36 **QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC**

None received.

37 **QUESTIONS BY COUNCILLORS**

None received.

38 **RF/17/2 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

Report RF/17/2

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

Application Number	Representations From
3506/16	Steve Butler (Barking Parish Council) Xy Stansfield (Needham Market Town Council) Mark Stannard (Objector) Robert Eburne (Applicant)
Application Number:	3506/16
Proposal:	Outline planning permission with vehicular access (all other matters reserved) for the construction of 152 residential dwellings (including market and affordable homes), garages, parking, vehicular access with Barking Road, estate roads, public open space, play areas, landscaping and amenity green space with sustainable drainage systems, with associated infrastructure, including provision for additional car parking and improved vehicular access to Needham Market Country Practice
Site Location:	BARKING, NEEDHAM MARKET – Barking Road, Needham Market IP6
Applicant:	Hopkins Homes Limited

The application had been considered by Development Control Committee B on 14 June 2017 when Members were minded to defer the application for a site visit and referral to the Planning Referrals Committee.

The Case Officer presented the application to the Committee outlining how the proposed site crossed the boundary between Needham Market and Barking. The Officer outlined how the consultation responses received had resulted in the recommendation of approval subject to conditions as detailed in the report.

The Case Officer responded to Members' questions on how the existing Doctor's surgery was built within the flood plain and public transport issues had been addressed through the travel plan and improvements to the bus shelter.

Matt Hullis, Suffolk County Council's Flood Management Team, responded to Members' questions that the attenuation pond was designed to cope with extraordinary events and possible extra capacity.

The Case Officer continued by answering Members' questions that there were no public footpaths within the site and that there were no plans to put in a pedestrian crossing.

Xy Stansfield, Needham Market Town Council, endorsed the statement that would be delivered by Councillor Mike Norris and also raised concerns about the additional pressure on infrastructure and inquired whether a roundabout could be accommodated for the junction of the Barking Road.

Steve Butler, Barking Parish Council, said that the Barking road was already a busy and dangerous road and that two fatal accidents had happened between 2005 and 2016. He continued by stating agreement with Needham Market Town Council's comments and that the infrastructure did not support additional traffic and strain on schools.

Mark Stannard, Objector, said that any development should have the infrastructure in place before construction began and that there had been little reassurance from the developer that flooding would not happen. He concluded by saying that he believed the proposed basin on the north of the site was not to take existing water but for a future application.

Robert Eburne, Applicant, outlined how the attenuation ponds were designed to cope with a 1 in 100 year flooding event with a built in capacity for climate change and 40% excess. Drainage was at a rate of 11 litres per second. He continued by outlining that a highways scheme had been proposed extending the 30mph limit and that the CIL contribution would amount to £1 million. No statutory objections had been received.

The Applicant responded to Members' questions explaining that there was no soakage into the ground and that the scheme had gone through a rigorous testing environment and that the water would attenuate in the basin and leave the site at a controlled rate. He said the site did not require an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) but the cumulative impact had been assessed. He continued by answering questions on the design of the attenuation ponds as well as queries around the highways and the lack of proposed crossings.

Councillor Mike Norris, Ward Member for Needham Market, said that there was a serious flooding issue and that the water course only worked when it was clear. He supported Needham Market Town Council in their proposal for a roundabout on the Barking Road. He continued by outlining that there was no entrance for emergency access to the site and that the existing infrastructure could not cope. He felt that this site should not be dealt with in isolation.

Councillor Anne Killeth, Ward Member for Barking and Somersham, reiterated the comments above and raised concerns over the increase in traffic which would access the A14 using the route under the railway bridge which encountered regular flooding. She also expressed concern regarding the increase in traffic on the Barking Road and the proposals for making the road safer.

Councillor David Whybrow questioned how many dwellings were needed before the trigger was for a second access to be included on a site to which the case officer responded that the number was 150 dwellings in the Suffolk Design Guide.

Councillor Wendy Marchant, Ward Member for Needham Market, said that not enough provisions were proposed to ameliorate the flooding problem and that it would create further problems downstream. She said that there were many issues of speeding accidents and fatalities and questioned whether Needham Market had the capacity to cope with the increased housing, particularly when considering the cumulative effect of all the proposed development sites.

In response to Members' questions the Ward Member advised that the distance from the school to the site would be at least a mile and that it would take 16 minutes to walk there from the proposed site.

Councillor David Whybrow outlined how Suffolk County Council's Highways Department were satisfied and had raised no objections and that no statutory objections had been raised. He said that the drainage situation had been worked on and that the development would bring infrastructure improvements to Needham Market. He concluded by outlining that the Council could not demonstrate a 5-year land supply and proposed the application for approval as per the Officer recommendation.

Councillor Jessica Fleming said that the development proposal could have been better and that she had concerns over the cumulative impact of the various development sites and signalled concern over the single access point to the site.

Councillor Sarah Mansel concurred with Councillor Fleming's comments and said that the concerns over flooding had been addressed but there was a lack of footpath on the north of the site to get to the Primary School.

Councillor Gerard Brewster seconded the proposal for permission as per the Officer recommendation with the added condition that an emergency access plan be considered. Councillor Whybrow agreed the additional condition.

The vote was drawn by 7 votes for and 7 against.

The Chairman, Councillor Kathie Guthrie used her casting vote against the proposal which was lost by 7 votes to 8.

Councillor Guthrie subsequently proposed that the application be refused on the grounds that safe and suitable access could not be achieved for all, that the development did not represent good design and failed to represent sustainable design. Councillor Sarah Mansel seconded the motion for refusal.

By 11 votes to 2

Decision – Refuse Planning Permission as:

The proposed development fails to ensure that safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people having to resort to a single vehicular and pedestrian access point which would be at risk of flood events and fails to ensure reasonable access or evacuation at times of flood. The development is moreover at a considerable distance from the school and community facilities. On that basis the development would not represent good design and would not make the place better for the residents of the locality. On that basis the development would be unacceptable having regard to paragraphs 101 to 103 of the NPPF, paragraph 32 of the NPPF and would fail to represent sustainable or precautionary development which would not conserve or enhance the local character of the area nor improve the economic, social or environmental conditions of the area contrary to policies FC1 and FC1.1 of the CSFR and policy CS4 of the Core Strategy

The meeting concluded at 5:30pm

Chairman

.....