



MELTON PARISH COUNCIL

PLA(17)M07

Planning and Transport Committee

Minutes of the meeting of the Melton Parish Council Planning and Transport Committee held on Wednesday 26 July 2017 commencing at 19:00 at Riverside Office, Robertson's Boatyard, Lime Kiln Quay, Woodbridge IP12 1BD.

Present:

Cllr Mr J E Bale Cllr Mr N Brown (in the Chair) Cllr Mr A G Corston	Cllr Mrs E J G Hilson Cllr Mr M Holmes
---	---

Absent:

Cllr Miss E A Barrington Cllr A H Porter	Cllr Mr M L Webb
---	------------------

In Attendance:

Mr W J Grosvenor Clerk to Melton Parish Council	3 members of the public
---	-------------------------

	PART ONE – OPEN TO THE PUBLIC
17.99	TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Barrington and Cllr Porter.
17.100	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST
17.100.01	To receive Amendments to the Register There were none.
17.100.02	To Receive Declarations of Pecuniary Interest in Respect of Items on the Agenda There were none.
17.100.03	To receive Declarations of Non Pecuniary Interest in Respect of Items on the Agenda There were none.
17.100.04	To Consider Full / Partial Dispensations for Pecuniary Interests Declared It was noted that there had been no requests for dispensations.
17.101	OPEN FORUM FOR MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC TO TALK TO COUNCILLORS The Chairman established that the members of the public present wanted to make representations about planning application DC/17/2840/FUL Former Council Offices, Melton Hill, Woodbridge. In their submissions, the residents raised a number of objections to the application, which may be summarised as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposals are contrary to the planning policies of Suffolk Coastal

	<p>District Council, in particular Local Plan Policy DM21, which requires developments to relate to the scale and character of their surroundings, and Local Plan Policy DM23, which requires proposals to have regard to matters of privacy / overlooking, and the physical relationship with other properties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed density is far in excess of the high density threshold set out in the Local Plan, and felt to be too high for the site in question. • The harshness of the design reflected more an inner city environment than a market town, and residents wanted a design that better reflected the character of Woodbridge and the site’s proximity to the AONB and the River Deben. • The proposed car parking provision falls well short of the Suffolk County Council parking standards guidance, and the shortfall against guidance of about 70 spaces will cause overspill problems that will impact on the surrounding community. • The proposals for the affordable housing element of the development do not accord with either the Local Plan in terms of unit sizes required, or the requirements of Suffolk Coastal’s Housing Service in terms of a mix of apartments and houses. • There were also concerns that the full build out would take a few years to complete, and that it should be phased, with effective arrangements put in place for both deliveries to site and bringing in operatives. • Also raised was the argument that there was a conflict of interest, with the sale of the site subject to a planning consent suitable for the applicant. Therefore would the Council decide the application on objective planning grounds or financial interest? [The Clerk advised that this was not a ground on which to object to the planning application.]
	<p><i>It was RESOLVED to take the following Planning Application Item out of order</i></p>
<p>17.103.06</p>	<p>DC/17/2840/FUL former Council Offices, Melton Hill, Woodbridge Proposed demolition of all the existing offices and surrounding buildings on the site and replacement with a high quality housing development providing 100 residential units (33 affordable) (C3), together with a community building (D1), and a retail unit that may be a coffee shop (A1/2/3) or a retail unit; a landscaped environment free from cars as they are to be located in an underground car park; means of access and other associated works. Following discussion, it was resolved unanimously to recommend refusal of the application. <i>Proposed by:</i> Cllr Brown <i>Seconded by:</i> Cllr Corston At the request of the Chairman the Clerk summarised the planning grounds on which the application could be justifiably recommended for refusal. These detailed reasons are set out below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The density proposed is far in excess of the high density threshold set out in the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan and too high for this sensitive site. The proposals which now form the application are markedly different from the original proposals; they were for around 70 units, the final submission is for 100. In terms of density, given the site of 1.32 hectares of which only 1.25 hectares is available to build on given flood zone designations, that equates to 80 dwellings per hectare. The Suffolk Coastal Local Plan states that high density would generally be regarded as 50 units per hectare i.e. 62.5 units for the 1.25 hectare site rather than the proposed 100.

- The housing mix proposed for the development is 89% 1 and 2 bedroom units. The Local Plan requires, in developments over 5 units, a mix in respect of combined open market / affordable housing of 13%, 32%, 34% and 20% for 1, 2, 3 and 4 bedrooms respectively. The mix proposed undoubtedly reflects the fact that the development as proposed is mostly apartments. However given the very high level of need for affordable family homes it is not surprising that the East Suffolk Housing service has expressed concern about the mix. All the affordable housing offered is in the form of apartments, and East Suffolk Housing has requested, on the basis of 33 affordable units, a better balance of houses and apartments i.e. 19 apartments and 14 houses. On the basis that such a revised mix would much better reflect the ability to meet housing need it should be considered in relation to whatever final numbers of dwellings might be agreed.
- Parking arrangements for residents are in the form of 93 spaces in the “undercroft” and 6 for visitors. Applying the Suffolk County Council parking standards guidance, 1, 1.5 and 2 parking spaces should be provided for 1, 2 and 3 bedroom units respectively, with a visitor allowance of 0.25 per unit. Based on that guidance the proposed development should more realistically have 145.5 allocated spaces, plus 25 for visitors. Whilst Suffolk Coastal District Council can legitimately allow fewer spaces than per the County Council’s guidance where there is proximity to a town centre, rail station etc., accepting provision on a 1:1 basis is likely to cause overspill parking arrangements for the wider community. Also provision is underground. Experience has shown in urban environments where this has been tried, that residents will rather park illegally or inconsiderately rather than use such provision because of both inconvenience and fear of crime. This element of the proposal should be revised.
- The design of the proposed development now applied for has undergone a radical change since the initial proposals last year. Although the applicant asserts community support for the plans as now submitted, but does not produce detailed evidence for this, there are over 230 letters of objection already lodged. Woodbridge Town Council has recommended that the application be rejected. The revised proposals include the demolition of the two Victorian / Edwardian buildings fronting Melton Hill. The Heritage Impact Assessment dismisses them as either being unexceptional or not a local landmark. Melton councillors disagree with that assessment, as many others already have. The buildings may be said to form a potential bridge between the traditional architecture along Melton Hill, and any new development, whereas what is proposed may look out of place intruding into the traditional street scene of Melton Hill. The bulk, scale and harsh urban form of the proposed new blocks has been masked by the soft-focus nature of the watercolour drawings designed to obscure their true impact. It has been estimated that the tallest of the new buildings, at 33 metres above ordnance datum, will be about the same height as the old pine tree, now cut down. The height and bulk of these new blocks may not only impact on the immediate surroundings e.g. Deben Road, but also in the longer distance views

	<p>across the River Deben and from the river path.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Melton councillors are concerned at the loss of trees on the site, in particular, the two black mulberries and the trees fronting Melton Hill. The RSPB and Suffolk Wildlife Trust, in their responses, have highlighted what they consider to be inadequacy in the submitted Habitats Regulations Assessment. The Suffolk Wildlife Trust does not consider that the information as submitted with the application demonstrates that the proposed development will not result in a significant adverse impact on the Deben Estuary SPA and Ramsar site, and on protected UK and priority species (reptiles). Councillors are also concerned at any worsening of the air quality on Melton Hill caused by the additional traffic attempting to exit the development at peak times. • In terms of both Suffolk Coastal planning policy and the National Planning Policy Framework, the application would appear to be deficient. Local Plan Policy SP26 requires opportunities to be balanced with constraints in Woodbridge to consolidate a town that “retains the quality of the built environment and the character of the riverside and the estuary”. Local Plan Policy DM21 requires developments to “relate to the scale and character of their surroundings, particularly in terms of their siting, height, massing and form”, and Local Plan Policy DM23 requires proposals to have regard to matters of privacy / overlooking and “the resulting physical relationship with other properties”. The National Planning Policy Framework requires (at paragraph 66) that applicants work closely with those directly affected by their proposals to evolve designs that take account of the views of the community. “Proposals that can demonstrate this in developing the design of the new development should be looked on more favourably.” Melton councillors feel that none of these requirements have been met. <p>The Clerk was requested to prepare and submit a letter of objection based on these planning grounds on behalf of the Parish Council.</p>
	<i>It was RESOLVED to revert to the order of the Agenda</i>
17.102	<p>MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING It was RESOLVED to agree the Minutes of the Planning and Transport Committee held on 21 June 2017 (Minutes PLA(17)M06 previously distributed). Proposed by: Cllr Brown Seconded by: Cllr Hilson</p>
17.103	TO REVIEW NEW PLANNING APPLICATIONS RECEIVED
17.103.01	<p>DC/17/2435/FUL Decoy House, Old Church Road, Melton Proposed alterations, conversion, extension and new build. It was resolved to make no comments in relation to this application.</p>
17.103.02	<p>DC/17/2436/LBC Decoy House, Old Church Road, Melton Proposed alterations, conversion, extension and new build. It was resolved to make no comments in relation to this application.</p>
17.103.03	<p>DC/17/2756/FUL 11 Bury Hill Close, Melton Proposed single storey extension to existing semi-detached house. It was resolved to recommend approval of the application as Melton PC Planning and Transport Committee considers the application to be in line with the National Planning Policy Framework, the Suffolk Coastal District Council Local Plan Core Strategy and Development Management Policies, and it is not aware of any objections from residents.</p>

17.103.04	<p>DC/17/2735/FUL East Lodge, Yarmouth Road, Melton Proposed conservatory extension.</p> <p>It was resolved to recommend approval of the application as Melton PC Planning and Transport Committee considers the application to be in line with the National Planning Policy Framework, the Suffolk Coastal District Council Local Plan Core Strategy and Development Management Policies, and it is not aware of any objections from residents.</p>
17.103.05	<p>DC/17/2736/LBC East Lodge, Yarmouth Road, Melton Proposed conservatory extension.</p> <p>It was resolved to recommend approval of the application as Melton PC Planning and Transport Committee considers the application to be in line with the National Planning Policy Framework, the Suffolk Coastal District Council Local Plan Core Strategy and Development Management Policies, and it is not aware of any objections from residents.</p>
17.103.07	<p>DC/17/2936/FUL 31 Garrod Approach, Melton Park Proposed installation of a detached timber garden room.</p> <p>It was resolved to recommend refusal of this retrospective application for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The size of the new garden office is excessive for the relatively small garden attached to this 3 storey town house within the Melton Park Conservation Area. • Its primary purpose would appear to be in connection with the applicant's business contrary to what is stated in the Design & Access Statement where it is said that the building "will be used as a domestic garden room the use of which will be incidental to the enjoyment of the main dwelling house" • This development does not take account of the residential amenity of neighbouring properties and arguably therefore is unacceptable in terms of development Management Policy DM23.
17.103.08	<p>DC/17/2971/VOC Unit 1, Riverside Business Centre, Dock Lane, Melton Variation of Condition Nos. 2 & 4 of DC/16/3661/FUL – Proposed change of use of existing factory (Class B1 C) to builder's Merchants Trade Counter (Class B8 use) and associated alterations (Revised Scheme) – Variation to allow better use of the site for external storage etc.</p> <p>It was resolved to recommend refusal of the application for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan 5970/2F which accompanies this application is not up to date, so it is difficult to follow the various changes that have both happened, and are proposed. • This is a retrospective application; the racking is already in place. The height and vivid colour of the structure combine to impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties and a less obtrusive solution should have been found. Development Management Policy DM23 should be engaged here. • The construction of the racking has reduced the number of parking spaces to only a fraction of the number stipulated, and could cause further and unacceptable parking problems in Dock Lane.
17.103.09	<p>DC/17/3121/FUL Melwood, Turnpike Lane, Melton Proposed removal of flat roof and replacement with pitched to match existing. Demolition of external store building and replacement with new single width garage. New triple refuse bin housing and external boundary fence alterations. Window replacement to end bedroom.</p> <p>It was resolved to recommend refusal of this application because it is considered that the siting of the proposed new garage would compromise the residential amenity of the occupiers of Parkside, Hackney Road in terms of</p>

	reducing access to daylight and sunlight (Development Management Policy DM23).
17.104	TO REVIEW UPDATES ON OTHER PLANNING APPLICATIONS
17.104.01	DC/17/0845/FUL unit 5, Riverside Business Centre, Dock Lane, Melton Proposed 2 no. floodlights on columns, 3 no. floodlights fixed to building, retention of 5 no. floodlights fixed to building and installation of 2 no. concrete bollards. MPC response sent 23 March recommending refusal. Request for referral to Suffolk Coastal Planning Committee submitted 5 April 2017. No further developments – a decision is still awaited. Clerk to email District Cllr Jim Bidwell to ask why the decision is so delayed.
17.105	TO REVIEW PLANNING NOTICES RECEIVED None were received.
17.106	TO CONSIDER NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN UPDATE Paper PLA(17)106 previously distributed was received. The further questions raised by the Independent Examiner and the responses as set out in this report were NOTED .
17.107	TO CONSIDER STATION ROAD TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES The Clerk reported that the meeting with residents on 27 July at 7pm would now take place in St Andrew's Church. Mr Ben Chester of Suffolk County Council and Mr Jon Pattle of the architects for the Riduna Park developers had confirmed attendance as had Mr Geof Butterwick. Cllr Brown will chair the meeting.
17.108	AMENITY LAND IN THE STREET – UPDATE Paper PLA(17)108 previously distributed was received. The report explained that the cost of the materials, in terms of the oak posts at circa £90.00 per post to meet the specifications of the Highways Authority, would now push the cost of the project to protect the amenity area around the village sign to approximately £1,440.00. As that would exceed the budget of £1,000.00, a report will need to be taken to Full Council on 13 September to seek an allocation of another £500.00 from reserves. Any further action on this project is stayed until a decision is made.
17.109	TO CONSIDER PLANNING ENFORCEMENT MATTERS
17.109.01	Suffolk Coastal DC Authorised Enforcement Action – Case update Paper PLA(17)109.01 previously distributed was received and NOTED .
17.109.02	Enforcement of Planning Control by Suffolk Coastal DC – Boat Avail, Saxons Reach, New Quay Lane, Melton Paper PLA(17)109.02 previously distributed was received. The report of the enforcement action being taken was NOTED . The Clerk advised that Suffolk Coastal DC Planning Committee Members would be carrying out a site visit on 31 July. Cllr Holmes to attend for Melton PC.
17.109.03	The Knacker's Yard – Contravention of terms on which planning application DC/16/0248/FUL was approved – update No further developments to report.
17.109.04	Land to the rear of Cedar House, Pytches Road This enforcement matter relates to the construction of a 6' close boarded fence between the new Cedar House site development and land belonging to Grove House. Issues relate to road safety and infringement of planning and highways requirements. The Clerk reported receipt of an email from a Planning Enforcement Officer at Suffolk Coastal DC stating that an initial site investigation has been conducted, and a follow up visit will be undertaken once the construction of the fence is complete.
17.110	STREET NAMING FOR WOODS LANE DEVELOPMENT Paper PLA(17)110 previously distributed was received and NOTED . The Clerk

	stated that Planning & Transport Committee does not currently have the delegated power to recommend names for new roads to Suffolk Coastal DC. Full Council will be asked to consider that as well as to make a decision on all recommendations received for the current requirements on 13 September.
17.111	<p>TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT ISSUES</p> <p>Cllr Corston reported an exchange of emails with Tony Buckingham of Highways. Additional pedestrian guardrails outside the school / Melton crossroads are not supported. Repairs to the potholes in Old Church Road will be undertaken within 20 working days from report and the removal of the broken hazard marker posts carried out within 14 weeks.</p> <p>In relation to the well obscured “Welcome to Melton” sign, notice will be served by Highways on the landowner to cut the hedge, if privately owned, or Highways will undertake cutting themselves, following the end of the nesting season (1 September).</p>
17.112	<p>TO RECEIVE A PROGRESS REPORT ON ACTIONS TAKEN ON MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS NOT OTHERWISE ON THE AGENDA</p> <p>Paper PLA(17)112 previously distributed was received and NOTED.</p>
17.113	<p>PLANNING COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN’S URGENT BUSINESS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A request was received from the Woods Lane developer, Bloor Homes, for a meeting with Parish Councillors to discuss aspects of Phase 2 of the development. AGREED Clerk to arrange an evening meeting in September, starting at 6.30 or 7pm.
	PART TWO - CONFIDENTIAL
	<p>Exempt / Confidential Item</p> <p>It was RESOLVED that, under section 100(a)(4) Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), the public be excluded from the meeting for the remaining item of business on the grounds that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act.</p>
17.115	<p>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</p> <p>The next meeting will take place on Wednesday 30 August 2017, commencing at 19:00 at Riverside Office, Robertson’s Boatyard, Lime Kiln Quay, Woodbridge IP12 1BD. There being no further business the meeting closed at 20:15.</p>