

Development Control Committee



Forest Heath
District Council

Minutes of a meeting of the **Development Control Committee** held on
Wednesday 2 May 2018 at **6.00 pm** at the **Council Chamber, District
Offices**, College Heath Road, Mildenhall IP28 7EY

Present: **Councillors**

Chairman Rona Burt
Vice Chairman Chris Barker

David Bowman	Brian Harvey
Louis Busuttill	Carol Lynch
Roger Dicker	David Palmer
Stephen Edwards	Peter Ridgwell

289. **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Andrew Appleby, Ruth Bowman J.P and Simon Cole. Councillor Louise Marston was also unable to attend the meeting.

290. **Substitutes**

There were no substitutes present at the meeting.

291. **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 7 March 2018 were unanimously received as a correct record and were signed by the Chairman.

292. **Planning Application DC/17/2676/FUL - Kininvie, Fordham Road, Newmarket**

Planning Application – (i) 63no. bed Care Home for the Elderly including car park, bicycle, refuse and garden store (ii) Alterations to vehicular and pedestrian access from Fordham Road (Demolition of existing house including associated swimming pool, outbuildings and hard-standing)

This application was referred to the Development Control Committee given the recommendation to grant planning permission was contrary to views

expressed by Newmarket Town Council that planning permission should be refused.

Officers were recommending that the application be approved, subject to the subsequent receipt of a report detailing the outcome of a further bat survey satisfactorily demonstrating that no specific mitigation measures for bats were required; and subject to conditions set out in paragraph 102 (and an additional condition reported at the meeting, as set out below).

The Principal Planning Officer reported the following updates to the report:

- (a) should planning permission be granted, the requested bat survey was expected to be carried out in June 2018. Planning permission would only be issued if the Local Planning Authority was satisfied that no specific mitigation measures would be required;
- (b) in respect of the proposed Section 106 Agreement, which would seek a developer contribution of £9,936 towards health infrastructure, the applicants had already agreed to the principle of this figure, which had been ascertained as a result of the NHS Trust's health impact assessment;
- (c) a correction to a typographical error within paragraph 81 of the report in respect of the table listing property addresses and separation distances. The figures listed as relating to 6 Meynell Gardens actually related to 8 Meynell Gardens, and vice versa; and
- (d) an additional proposed condition, whereby should permission be granted, the development would need to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Speakers:

- (a) Jill Rogers (resident) - spoke against the application
- (b) Bernard Spears (agent for applicant) - spoke in support of the application

Some concern was expressed regarding the following issues:

- (a) that the size and scale of the proposed building was too large and the scheme was an overdevelopment of the site;
- (b) the developer contribution under the proposed Section 106 agreement appeared to be a derisory amount;
- (c) the scheme appeared not to enhance the neighbouring Conservation Area;
- (d) the impact on the residential amenity during the construction period;
- (e) the proposed management of waste, such as the frequency of emptying wheelie bins, and the disposal of clinical waste;
- (f) the location for storing mobility scooters;
- (g) the proposed management of surface water run-off and drainage; and
- (h) the impact on the horse racing industry;

to which the Principal Planning Officer provided comprehensive responses, reiterating the content of the report and/or presentation that had addressed the above concerns, or explaining that issues raised regarding (e) above could be addressed by imposing an additional condition.

During the debate, a motion to grant planning permission (subject to receipt of the bat survey and conditions outlined above) was proposed by Councillor David Bowman, which was duly seconded by Councillor Louis Busuttil.

The debate continued and whilst the majority of Members acknowledged the need for a care home in this location, concern was expressed regarding what was considered to be insufficient car parking provision of 22 spaces, and whether there was adequate space for emergency vehicles to manoeuvre within the car parking area, as outlined in the plans attached to the report.

It was acknowledged that the car parking was likely to be utilised by staff and visitors rather than residents; however, it was considered that further information was required from the Highways Authority in respect of how it had reached its conclusions set out in paragraph 15 of the report, and in particular, how it considered that the proposed parking provision of 22 spaces was acceptable and the scale by which a maximum level set out within its Suffolk Guidance for Parking was determined.

As proposer of the motion to approve, Councillor David Bowman withdrew his proposal to grant permission and moved a deferral of the application for further information instead. As seconder of the original motion to approve, Councillor Busuttil, agreed to withdraw that seconding, and seconded the proposed deferral instead.

Upon being put to the vote, and with the vote being unanimous, it was resolved that

Decision:

Planning Application DC/17/2676/FUL, Kininvie, Fordham Road, Newmarket, be **DEFERRED** to enable further information to be obtained from the Highways Authority, in respect of how it had reached its conclusions set out in paragraph 15 of the report, and in particular, how it considered that the proposed parking provision of 22 spaces was acceptable and the scale by which a maximum level set out within its Suffolk Guidance for Parking was determined.

The Meeting concluded at 7.03 pm

Signed by:

Chairman
