

Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting

Held at the Court House, Stradbroke

Monday, 3rd June 2019 @ 5.30pm

Present: Don Darling, Chris Edwards (Chair), Jeremy Fox, Stuart Gemmill

In attendance: Odile Wladon (Clerk), Jason Vince & David Smith from Earlswood Homes, Melanie Barrow & James Hargrave from All Saints Schools Trust, 6 members of the public

PL.19.6.1	Chairs Welcome (1) CE welcomed all to the inaugural meeting of the Planning Committee and reminded all present that the committee was a recommendatory committee. (2) The Chair reminded those present of the wording of the referendum question for the recently made Neighbourhood Plan: <i>“Do you want Mid Suffolk District council to use the Neighbourhood Plan for Stradbroke to help it decide planning applications in the Neighbourhood Plan area?”</i> The referendum result was 80% YES and 20% NO (3) The Chair reminded all present that Mid Suffolk District Council remains the determining authority for all planning applications, and that the Neighbourhood Plan is material in decision making and carries great weight when determining planning applications.
PL.19.6.2	There were no councillor absences to note.
PL.19.6.3	Declaration of Interest: (1) Chris Edwards and Jeremy declared a Local Non-Pecuniary Interest as members of the Stradbroke Community Land Trust. Other Councillors present as follows: James Hargrave was present at the meeting to represent the All Saints Schools Trust. Pam Cane raised questions during the public forum. (2) There were no declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests (3) There were no requests for dispensations.
PL.19.6.4	Pre planning submission forum: Land South of Mill Lane (Policy STRAD18 – Stradbroke Neighbourhood Plan) (1) Mr Vince and Mr Smith of Earlswood Home made a presentation to the meeting. Mr Vince congratulated Stradbroke on a very well put together Neighbourhood Plan. However, the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan do present Earlswood with challenges due to current market circumstances. A full copy of the presentation can be viewed on the Planning Committee page of the Parish Council website at: https://www.stradbrokepc.org/planning-committe Earlswood Homes are seeking the Parish Council’s support in backing changes to Policy STRAD18 are follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Earlswood Homes feel that they cannot deliver the site as the policy stands at the moment.• Earlswood Homes would like to bring the site forward and are keen to listen to feedback from all stakeholders.• Earlswood Homes stated the combination of rising costs, Brexit and

abnormal infrastructure costs involved meant it was not viable in line with the AECOM Neighbourhood Plan appraisals.

- Earlswood Homes are therefore proposing a larger scheme of between 100-110 dwellings which would be achieved by either expanding the site or changing the mix of housing with a reduction to the affordable housing obligation.

(2) **All Saints Schools Trust – Stradbroke Primary School**

James Hargrave and Melanie Barrow addressed the meeting as follows:

- The school has worked closely with the Parish Council during the production of the Neighbourhood Plan.
- The school would like to see a housing mix that would encourage families with young children in to Stradbroke. This would help to counter the problem all local schools are experiencing of a demographic drop in the number of children.
- The school has already agreed to a reduced provision for the car park, but hope that the area allocated to the rear of the school would provide a carpark and bus drop off area. This could help to alleviate some of the problems experienced in Queens Street.
- The school is responsible to the residents of Stradbroke and is part of the local community and does not want to be the cause, or focus, of an increase in numbers on any site included in the Neighbourhood Plan. The school would be fully supportive of a policy compliant planning application for this site.

(3) **Public Forum**

4 members of the public (a. to d.) spoke during the public forum:

a. *How much bigger would the site need to be?*

The density seems high?

A turning circle for the bus would be large and would this affect the costs?

Would the scheme need to be approved by Highways?

How many car parking spaces would be provided?

Earlswood Homes responded that the site would either need to be expanded to the western boundary or between 105-110 dwellings built. A greater level of detail would be provided at a future meeting once the request to enlarge the site had been responded to.

CE responded that the site is the same as one proposed since 2003. All of the infrastructure requirements have been modelled, this modelling shows the site can accommodate what is included in Policy STRAD18 and supporting narrative.

b. *Would there be parking for others in Stradbroke?*

The proposed parking in intended for school staff only to release the area adjacent to the nursery.

Earlswood Homes responded that the land owner may potentially have scope to include more car parking but would need to increase density.

	<p><i>c. Has raised concerns in the past concerning the site and is opposed to the development and the impact it will have on their Grade II listed property. Biggest concern was the access via Mill Lane – with the potential addition of 250-300 vehicles plus school buses. The existing road is not wide enough. Very disappointed that a more holistic approach had not been taken and asked why consideration had not been given to move the school.</i></p> <p>Mr Hadingham (landowner) stated that Suffolk County Council has measured the width of Mill Lane and it was deemed compliant and wide enough for the development.</p> <p>The representatives of the school stated that there were no plans to move the school given that there were 94 children on roll with space for up to 150. There was no money available to move a school that had capacity to grow. It was pointed out that the school had been on its current site for 150 years and it was surprising that someone would buy a house next to a school and then complain about its location.</p> <p><i>d. Flats were referenced – how big will these be?</i></p> <p>Earlswood Homes responded that they anticipate about 1/3 of the development to be flats but these would look like houses, not high rise.</p> <p>If Earlswood Homes receive the support of the Parish Council for their proposals they would look to produce sketches and plans of the site by the end of the summer.</p> <p>Earlswood Homes pointed out that anyone could market a field, but if there was no return then there was no incentive for a developer to build.</p>
<p>PL.19.6.5 (1)</p>	<p>Review by Councillors</p> <p>Earlswood Home summarised their position as follows: The company would like to build out the site as it would be viewed as their “jewel in the crown” in East Anglia. Currently, the site is considered by them to be too small to be viable and they would need to expand the site from 75 to 100 plus dwellings to incorporate the facilities needed or there would have to be a reduction in the affordable* housing to below 10% or possibly none at all. (* affordable housing in this sense refers to social housing)</p> <p>The Chair noted that the plan was examined and went forward with a narrative that the provision of affordable housing may not be fully met (final paragraph page 43 of Stradbroke Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2036)</p> <p>Councillors noted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents are looking for homes that are affordable to buy on the open market. • What happens if all sites included in the plan ask to increase the number of dwellings by 25%? Would a site need to be removed from the Plan? • Councillors noted that any material changes to the plan, such as increasing number of homes significantly, would need to be approved by a further public referendum. • Viability is a snap shot in time. Plan making viability appraisals are not

	<p>predictive but intended as an aid to policy making.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost of land is not a material issue – if developer pays too much, this is a developer problem. The NPPF is clear on this point. • Earlswood Homes commented that development is only possible if land owner is willing to sell the land. <p>Mr Vince congratulated the Committee on the meeting and was impressed with the planning knowledge shown. Earlswood Homes representatives left at this point.</p> <p>(2) There was then further discussion by Councillors. The issue of setting a precedent by overriding policy for one site became a key line. CE stated that in his opinion costs could be reduced in a number of ways for the developer.</p> <p>Councillors agreed a motion to recommend to the Parish Council that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. That the Earlswood Homes site expansion proposal be rejected. b. Any planning application submitted must, within reason, be compliant with Neighbourhood Plan Policy STRAD18. There is some flexibility in numbers due to the car park reduction from 3000sqm to 1000sqm size. c. That the developer produces a DAT viability appraisal for approximately 76 homes.
PL.19.6.6	<p>Terms of Reference</p> <p>The Committee agreed a Terms of Reference document to be approved by the Parish Council at the next meeting.</p>
PL.19.6.7	<p>The date of the next meeting: 25th June 2019 @ 7.30pm, Court House, Queen St</p>

Meeting closed at 7pm.

Signed: _____

Date: