

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EXTRAORDINARY SPROUGHTON PARISH COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD AT THE TITHE BARN, LOWER STREET, SPROUGHTON ON
29TH FEBRUARY 2012, 7:30PM**

Councillors present:

Cllr S.Curl (Chairman), Cllr B.Askew, Cllr A.Cronin, Cllr H.Davies, Cllr J.Kitson, Cllr D.Lavington,

Mrs S Frankis, Clerk & Responsible Financial Officer

District Cllr, Nicholas Ridley

8 Sproughton residents

3 Bramford residents

119 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE TO BE RECEIVED

No apologies were received.

120 TO ACCEPT MEMBERS DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

121 TO CONSIDER PLANNING APPLICATION NO: MSDC 2914/11; USE OF LAND FOR THE SITING OF 3 NO. 2 BEDROOM STATIC CARAVANS AND 1 TOURING CARAVAN FOR OCCUPATION BY GYPSIES/TRAVELLERS. ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY AMENITY BUILDING, BOUNDARY WALL AND ACCESS GATES, CONSTRUCTION OF HARDSTANDING AND NEW VEHICULAR ACCESS; LAND OPPOSITE RUNCTON COTTAGE, LORAINIE WAY, BRAMFORD

Cllr S.Curl advised that as the application is not within the Parish boundaries of Sproughton, the Parish Council has not been formally consulted by Mid Suffolk District Council (MSDC).

The Council considered the details of the planning application.

Cllr J.Kitson referred to the Government Guidance document on the design of amenity blocks for traveller sites which states there should be an amenity block for each pitch. The proposed development does not meet this recommendation as there is only one proposed amenity block to serve three (four) caravans.

Cllr D.Lavington asked if there would be a S106 requirement for the application.

Cllr D.Lavington questioned the suitability of the site for residential development as the 'banking' around the site could result in land slippage.

Cllr D.Lavington observed that the ownership of the land surrounding the proposed development site is unclear; therefore the proposed development could lead the way for further development.

Cllr D.Lavington observed that the proposed development site is on a road with the national speed limit; he questioned if there should be a requirement for a slip-road access to the site.

Cllr D.Lavington considered that it would be informative to know what other proposals have been brought forward for the proposed development site and the reasons as to why they have been refused.

Cllr H.Davies noted there are overhead electricity cables at the proposed development site and questioned if there are rules relating to the clearance over residential sites.

7.52pm The meeting was adjourned to receive comments from the members of the public.

Cllr S.Curl ascertained there were no members of the press, MSDC, the applicant or representatives of the applicant for the proposed development present.

A member of the public advised the proposed development site had formerly been a garden area relating to cottages that had been demolished during the 1960's in order to straighten the B1113.

A member of the public advised the proposed planning application does not meet MSDC Policy No: H11 as five previous planning applications have been registered for the proposed development site and refused. Therefore on the strength of MSDC Policy No: H11 application no: 2914/11 should be refused.

A member of the public considered that the proposed amenity block lends itself to becoming a residential unit.

A member of the public referred to the question previously raised of the applicant owning land adjacent to the proposed development site. He advised that the application details should show the proposed development site in red line, would show any other land owned by the applicant in blue line.

A member of the public questioned the exceptional need for the proposed development site to be situated in the countryside when provisions are available within a few miles.

A member of the public noted there is no other significant development between Bramford and Sproughton and this stretch of undeveloped land acts as buffer zone between the two parishes.

8.20pm The Meeting was reconvened.

The Council unanimously agreed to recommend refusal of planning application no: MSDC 2914/11 and to support this recommendation with the following material considerations;

1. The Government Guidance document on the design of amenity blocks for traveller sites states there should be an amenity block for each pitch. The proposed development does not meet this recommendation as there is only one proposed amenity block to serve three (four) caravans.
2. The proposed amenity block shows details of only one shower and toilet to serve three (four) caravans. The Council considers this to be inadequate provision. If the proposed amenity block were to be developed as proposed, the block would be tantamount to a building suitable for residential occupation, and likely to be occupied so.
3. Would there be a requirement for a S106 requirement with the application.
4. The Council questions the suitability of the site for residential development as the 'banking' around the site could result in land slippage inwards towards the proposed development.
5. The Council notes that there are overhead electricity cables over the proposed development site and questions if there are rules relating to the clearance over residential sites.
6. Planning application no:2914/11 appears not to comply with MSDC Policy No: H11. It is apparent that five previous planning applications, of which a number were for permanent residential development, have been registered for proposed development of the site and have been refused. On the strength of MSDC Policy No: H11, planning application no: 2914/11 should be refused.
7. The Council notes the ownership of the land surrounding the proposed development site is unclear. It is understood that should the applicant own any land adjacent to the proposed development site, this would be shown as a blue line on the application location plan. The Council seeks clarification that the applicant does not own land adjacent to the proposed development site, as ownership could lead the way for further development.
8. The Council notes the area marked on the proposed development site plan marked for storage of vehicles/equipment relating to the clients commercial activities. The Council seeks clarification that the application site is to be used for domestic use and will not to be used for commercial and business purposes.
9. The Council considers planning application no:2914/11 does not comply with MSDC Policy No: CS10, it has not been demonstrated there is a need for the development. It is apparent that the intended occupant of the proposed development already has a site.
10. Planning application no:2914/11 does not meet MSDC Policy No: H16. The proposed development would(i) lead to a loss of open space which currently contributes to the character and appearance of the area (ii) the development would reduce the privacy of adjacent dwellings as well as eroding the character of the surrounding area (iii) a series of previously registered applications for the development of this site have been refused. On the strength of MSDC Policy No: H16, planning application no: 2914/11 should be refused.
11. On the strength of MSDC Policy No: T10, planning application no: 2914/11 should be refused as (i) the plans show no provision for safe access to and egress from the proposed development site on a stretch of road endorsed by the national speed limit (ii) the existing roads do not provide suitable and safe access to the proposed development site, in terms of vehicular and pedestrian traffic.
12. The Council considers that an environmental study is required for the proposed development site as it is known that a number of wildlife species, including badgers, inhabit the environs of the site.
13. The Council considers that paragraph 5 of the application documents could indicate that a premature view was reached by an officer of MSDC dealing with the application which could lead to a prejudicial recommendation and decision being made.

The meeting closed at 8.25pm.

Chairman : _____

Date: _____

