

112. PLANNING APPLICATION DC/13/0660/FUL – LAND OFF BRISCOE WAY, LAKENHEATH (REPORT NO DEV14/131)

Councillor D W Gathercole declared a local non-pecuniary interest in respect of this item as he was a Lakenheath Parish Councillor.

Detailed (full) application for the erection of 67 dwellings (including 20 affordable dwellings) together with 1500sqm of public open space.

This application was referred to the Development Control Committee as it was a proposal for ‘major’ development and the recommendation to grant planning permission was contrary to the provisions of the extant Development Plan. The proposal also raised complex planning issues of District-wide importance.

The Committee was advised that the proposals were considered to comply with the relevant policies of the National Planning Policy Framework but the ‘countryside’ location of the site meant the proposed housing development conflicted with adopted Development Plan policies.

The Committee was reminded that the application was first reported to them at their meeting on 14 May 2014 but following the receipt of late representations on behalf of Lakenheath Parish Council and Suffolk County Council the item was subsequently withdrawn from the agenda prior to consideration.

A Member site visit had been held prior to the meeting, Officers were recommending that planning permission be granted, as set out in Paragraphs 229-232 of Report No DEV14/131, subject no new concerns, objections or material planning issues being raised by Natural England, the Suffolk Wildlife Trust or the RSPB.

The Principal Planning Officer – Major Projects further advised the Committee that since publication of the agenda further representations had been received as summarised: ☐ A letter of objection from Lakenheath Community Primary School’s Governing Body (circulated to Members under separate cover); and ☐ A letter of objection from Cerda Planning Ltd, acting on behalf of Lakenheath Parish Council (circulated to Members under separate cover).

The Officer again made reference to the former USAFE personnel dwellings at Lords Walk which had recently come onto the housing market. He again reminded Members that Officers had verified that this stock of dwellings was already counted as ‘existing’ housing stock and could not, therefore, be counted as a contribution towards the five year supply of housing in the District.

Lastly, the Officer drew attention to the recommendation set out in Paragraph 229 of the report and explained that the word “outline” needed to be removed from this (as it was a full application) and the S106 contribution towards primary school education needed to be amended to read £325,766 (as opposed to £251,090).

Councillor D W Bowman proposed that the application be approved, as recommended by Officers, including the corrections to Paragraph 229 and that the delivery of the scheme be phased in order to allow time in which for the infrastructure to be put in place (as per the previous applications). This was duly seconded by Councillor W Hirst.

Following the Lawyer having advised on appropriate wording, the Chairman put the amendment to the vote and with 11 voting for the motion, 4 against and with 1 abstention, it was resolved:

That subject no new concerns, objections or material planning issues being raised by Natural England, the Suffolk Wildlife Trust, or the RSPB planning permission be GRANTED subject to:

1. The completion of a S106 agreement to secure: ☐ Affordable housing (30% = 20 units on site and 0.1 units by means of a developer contribution) ☐ Education contribution (Primary School - £251,090) ☐ Pre-school contribution (£42,637) ☐ Libraries Contribution (£14,472) ☐ Public Open Space contribution (Provision on site and contribution of £350,250)

☐ Strategic Highway Contribution (should this be deemed compliant with CIL Regulation 122 – a proportionate contribution would be appropriate, sum to be determined) ☐ SPA Recreational Impact Contribution – which may include monitoring of potential impacts from development (should this be deemed compliant with CIL Regulation 122 – sum to be determined) ☐ The phasing and timing of the delivery of the scheme be negotiated for the development to ensure appropriate infrastructure is in place ☐ Any further clauses considered necessary by the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services.

2. Following completion of the planning obligation referred to at Recommendation 1 above, the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services be authorised to grant planning permission subject to conditions, including: ☐ Time limit (3 years for commencement) ☐ Materials (use of those proposed) ☐ Sustainable construction (further details to be approved and thereafter implemented) ☐ Bin and cycle storage strategy for the affordable units (details to be approved and thereafter implemented) ☐ Public open space (strategy for future management and maintenance) ☐ Landscaping (precise details of new hard and soft landscaping) ☐ Retention and protection of existing trees and hedgerows ☐ Ecology (enhancements at the site) ☐ Construction management plan ☐ As recommended by LHA ☐ Contamination & remediation (further investigations and any remediation necessary) • Means of enclosure ☐ Noise mitigation ☐ Fire Hydrants ☐ Waste minimisation and re-cycling strategy ☐ Implementation of the surface water drainage scheme. ☐ Any additional conditions considered necessary by the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services.

3. In the event of the Head of Planning and Regulatory Planning Services recommending alternative (reduced) Heads of Terms from those set out at Recommendation 1 above, or Natural England the RSPB and/or the Suffolk Wildlife Trust raise objections concerns or substantive issues about the proposals which have not already been considered by the Committee, the planning application be returned to Committee for further consideration.

4. In the event the applicant declines to enter into a planning obligation to secure the Heads of Terms set out at Recommendation 1 above for reasons considered unreasonable by the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services, planning permission be refused for the following reasons: i) Unsustainable form of development not mitigating its impact upon, education provision (primary and pre-school), open space, sport and recreation and libraries (contrary to the Framework and Core Strategy policy CS13 and saved Local Plan policy 10.3).

ii) If appropriate following further investigation; adverse cumulative impacts upon, the highway network and the Special Protection Area (from increased recreational pressure) iii) Non-compliance with affordable housing policy (contrary to Core Strategy policy CS9 and supporting SPD document)

Speakers: Mrs Emma Vincent (Head Teacher of Lakenheath Community Primary School) spoke against the application Mr Michael Robson (Cerda Planning Ltd, acting on behalf of Lakenheath Parish Council) spoke against the application.

Councillor D W Gathercole left the meeting at 8.27pm following the conclusion of the above item.