



PLANNING COMMITTEE

Agenda item	Name	Planning Committee
	Date of meeting	18th May as a remote meeting using Zoom at 18.30 The meeting was conducted in accordance with the published agenda distributed by the clerk on 14 th May 2020
1	Present Members of the public	Councillors: Richard Berry (chair), Johnnie Walker (vice chair), Tunie Brandon joined the meeting at 19:00, Andrew Evitt, Jane Hudson, Joan Mann, Lowel O’Mard, Mike Smith, Karen Turner Co-opted members Gary Rowland Tim Glenton, Angus Cameron, Penny Mc Sheehy, George and Christine Hooker (joined at 18:45)
2.	Apologies and Approval of Absences	Apologies from District Councillor Peter Gould although not a member of the planning committee was unable to join as he was committed elsewhere. He would however be at Full Council should anyone wish to ask questions on the Paddock House application. Cllr Berry reported that he had received an update from Cllr Gould this afternoon. At the public consultation meeting held in January an undertaking was made to re-orientate plots 15 and 16 in the south west corner of the site. This does not appear in the design proposals, but Cllr Gould has received an assurance that this will be done, and a revised layout issued and the consultation period extended for comments to be made specifically on this. Apologies from Cllr Mike Gibbs who had tried to join the meeting via telephone but had been unsuccessful. He would like it noted that he supported this application.
3.	Members Declarations of Interests and Consideration of Requests for Dispensations	None



PLANNING COMMITTEE

4.	Declarations of lobbying	None
5.	Site visits	Visual inspection only
6.	Public Participation	<p>1) Tim Glenton – stated that he had been interested in the development of the scheme for some time. He had met Jonathan Stephenson, ex Senior Director from MSDC last August and was given assurances that a green space would be protected. He stated that looking at the proposed plans, Units 1, 2, 3, 4 appear to encroach on to what he felt should be protected green space. These are more like verges than garden. He would like to know what the reasoning behind this decision is.</p> <p>2) Penny McSheehy – Also concerned about the green space citing that it was smaller than the last consultation meeting had led her to expect.</p> <p>3) George Hooker – Also has concerns regarding the area of the preserved green space advocating that in his view it should be as big as possible</p> <p>4) Gary Rowland – Has two areas of concern the size of the green space and parking for the town.</p> <p>He had anticipated that the garden area would become the green space. This has been considerably reduced since the consultation in Jan 20. He felt that 10 meters would be more acceptable as green space.</p> <p>Cllr Berry confirmed that ETC would be maintaining the green space going forward with the support of volunteers. This is a future responsibility and volunteer help would be needed.</p> <p>Loss of parking – He felt that there were currently 20 spaces along Wellington Road which would be lost. Cllr Berry believed that it was less net loss than 20 and stated that parking in Eye would not be solved by altering the design of Paddock House. A more strategic solution was needed, and this would be addressed under his presentation in item 7.</p> <p>Gary Rowland asked about plans for the potential parking site at the Rettery. Cllr Berry confirmed that this is in the current edition of the Neighbourhood Plan but in practice will be difficult to deliver. Further opportunities are being investigated.</p>



PLANNING COMMITTEE

		<p>Cllr Berry thanked Gary for his work supporting the Planning Committee in his co-opted role. He looked forward to continuing to work with him in seeking solutions for parking for the whole area of the town and its many stakeholders</p> <p>Cllr Berry asked the Clerk to read out the letters which had been received by members of the public. These were shared with the meeting and are available as appendices at the end of these minutes. They are all supportive</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Letter of Support 01 – Appendix 1 ii. Letter of Support 02 – Appendix 2 iii. Letter of Support 03 – Appendix 3 <p>In addition, Cllr Berry had received a letter from another co-optee, Stephen Neave, stating that the design of the proposal was of a high quality and care should be taken that this was not reduced under future viability exercises. A stipulation should also be made that work should start on site within 12 months</p>
7.	Consideration of Applications	Summary of recommendations to take to full council

DC/20/01537	Former Paddock House Care home	Erection of 16 affordable dwellings
<p>Cllr Berry led the discussion with the following. After much consideration and having read the application it is my intention to support it. This has not been an easy decision as the project should never have been initially presented in the form that it was and what was described as consultation in the early stages was really information on a land use strategy already decided.</p> <p>I have come to this view for three main reasons:</p>		



PLANNING COMMITTEE

1. Looking back, I can remember a scheme with 20 homes all for rent and another proposal for 22. These used pretty well all the green space and the site density and parking provision was unacceptable. It may well have been that finance was a driving factor in ‘packing’ the site above even MSDC’s own guidelines.

A compromise was needed. The scheme now has 16 homes with the tenure changed to include shared ownership units (this is echoed in appendix 02) which I fully support. The green space has largely been saved though, like some of the speakers in section 6, I would have preferred more. I believe that the scheme represents a sound compromise and is no longer purely finance driven but needs driven. MSDC has incurred a financial ‘hit’ for this and it is largely thanks to our district councillor that this has not become an insurmountable obstacle. We have achieved significant concessions.
2. The scheme as presented in my judgement broadly complies with the requirement of Policy Eye5 in the Referendum version of the Eye Neighbourhood Plan (ENP) dated May 2020. The ENP was given significant weight by the Planning Inspector in the recent Tuffs Rd appeal and we should award it significant weight here. The ENP allocated 16 affordable homes and the area of the site reserved for a green space is comparable, in my opinion.
3. The accommodation that this scheme will deliver is much needed. People who perhaps don’t attend council meetings have stopped councillors and asked about progress – twice this morning to me alone. Young people living in expensive private sector rental accommodation or unable to afford to live in Eye will want to get this scheme going and we owe it to them to do so. We should also push for a local residency connection to be included in the future allocations process. We owe it to people who need these homes to get this scheme moving.

Also given the level of pre-application discussion which has taken place there is a good chance that the scheme could be approved anyway. We have a better chance of influencing a scheme we have supported.

I come to these views despite the regrettable loss of parking. The question of parking will be the subject of a separate working group within the Eye Neighbourhood Plan team and additional community representatives are welcome.

I intend to propose a number of conditions on this support including reviewing the resolution of matters to plots 15 and 16 raised with the district councillor, the ring fencing and protection of the green space from the construction works in order to protect it and a traffic management plan for the construction period and, as suggested by Mr Neave, that the project must start on site in its current scope within 12 months. These are not strictly planning matters, but I feel need to be raised now.

Paddock House has been an eyesore for too long and now, in my judgement is the time for talk and discussion to cease and building work to begin. Ask anyone who is waiting for an affordable home.

I would now like to listen to the comments of councillors.



PLANNING COMMITTEE

Cllr Evitt – The difference between the first plans to now is unrecognisable. MSDC has suffered a considerable loss over this development. I believe that this is the final plan which will be submitted by MSDC. ETC should accept this application with the conditions raised by Cllr Berry.

Cllr Smith – The protected tree is the Indian bean tree which he is pleased will be secured during development. The bee orchids are beside the tree so these will also be saved. Trees should be protected before any works start, which will mean the fence will need to be moved back. The reduction of the green space necessary for turning space and access for emergency services. He too supported acceptance.

Cllr Mann – This is the best deal we can get and should press ahead with it and should be developed as soon as possible.

Cllr Turner – Confirmed that she was in complete agreement with all being said and supports the application.

Cllr Walker – Agrees with Cllr Berry this should not be left as an eyesore any longer than necessary. Concerned that if we do not accept this application, we run the risk that MSDC might revert to the original plans. It should be remembered that these were much less suitable.

Cllr O'Mard – Believes this needs to move forward. He feels that the type of development compliments the ambition of the ENP. We are fortunate to have this type of development in the town centre where people have easy access to the services the town offers.

Cllr Hudson – A lot of hard work has gone into getting this compromise from MSDC, everyone involved should be congratulated.

The following recommendation should be put to Full Council that ETC supports the application for Paddock House for the following reasons:

- 1) It shows significant movement away from proposals deemed unacceptable in previous consultations and is a reasonable compromise between community aspirations and MSDC service needs.**
- 2) The application broadly conforms to Policy Eye 5 of the ENP**
- 3) It will deliver much needed affordable homes in Eye including shared ownership accommodation which the council fully supports**

The loss of parking is a concern and should be minimised and ETC asks MSDC to allocate resources for the Eye area as it develops its Civil Parking Enforcement Strategy to address parking more widely in order to deliver Community Aspiration 1 of the ENP.

This support is conditional on:

- 1. Successful resolution of the orientation of plots 15 and 16 and observations made by residents to the north side of Church St to the district councillor.**
- 2. The separation and protection of the area reserved for the green space from construction activities but still retaining the funding for landscaping and other works within the scheme budget and offering community representatives an opportunity to influence the design and specification development of this area.**



PLANNING COMMITTEE

- 3. A working operations plan to address site practices including traffic management for deliveries and working hours.
- 4. A local connection provision for the allocation of homes
- 5. The works on site beginning at the scope and quality proposed in the application and within 12 months

Proposed by Cllr Smith second Cllr Brandon - all in favour – motioned carried.

DC/20/01690	Progress Power, Eye	Application for discharge of conditions
DC/20/01778		

No comments
Proposed by Cllr Evitt second Cllr Mann - all in favour – motioned carried.

DC/20/01696	Conifer Cottage, 84 Brome Avenue, Eye	Listed Building Consent - Replacement of 6no Windows.
-------------	---------------------------------------	---

No Comments
Proposed by Cllr Smith second Cllr Mann - all in favour – motioned carried.

DC/20/01818	18 Lambseth St, Eye	Application for listed building consent
-------------	---------------------	---

No comments
Proposed by Cllr Evitt second Cllr Walker - all in favour – motioned carried.

DC/20/01831	Cranley Mill, Cranley Rd, Eye	Erection of dwelling, garage and extension to driveway
-------------	-------------------------------	--

This is a resubmission with revised plans for an application which was rejected by MSDC last year. ETC had no objection at the time. Since then the Eye Neighbourhood Plan has passed its independent examination and is now ready for referendum with the latest edition dated May 2020. The council has formally adopted this document, and this should be given substantial weight in assessing future applications.



PLANNING COMMITTEE

The plans in the new application are considered to be contrary to Policy Eye15 of the ENP

Recommend to object on this basis.

Proposed by Cllr Brandon second Cllr Turner - all in favour – motioned carried.

8.0 Determinations and appeals to note received since last meeting

DC/20/00883	15 Church Street, Eye	Planning application withdrawn
DC/20/01268	C & K Meats Ltd, Potash Lane, Eye	Planning permission granted.
DC/19/02270	The Barn, Langton Grove, Eye	Planning permission granted.
DC/20/00781	5 Magdalen Street, Eye	Discharge of conditions

Noted by committee

9. Other Planning Matters

None raised.

The meeting closed at 19.30

Distribution of minutes – all present, apologies, district councillor Peter Gould, Town clerk

Next meeting Monday 15th June @ 06:30 pm as a virtual meeting.

PLANNING COMMITTEE



EYE TOWN COUNCIL

Appendix 01

Wellington Road,
Eye, Suffolk
IP23 7BG

17.05.2020

Dear Clerk,
Eye Town Council,

Re :- DC/20/01537
Paddock House Care Home

I support this application.

The redevelopment of this site will help to enhance the conservation area in the town. There is also a good mix of dwellings, sizes and affordability to cater for the different accommodation needs. Some will be arranged on a shared ownership scheme, which allows for affordability, while maintaining a long term interest in tenure.

The overall design of the site is in keeping with the traditional houses in Church Street and the newer homes in Brewer's Yard.

This application has been long overdue and I appreciate the hard work of the councillors who have negotiated this acceptable outcome.

Yours Sincerely

[Redacted Signature]

Eye Town Council,
Tacon Close,
Eye

PLANNING COMMITTEE



EYE TOWN COUNCIL

Appendix 02

Eye Town Council Planning Committee

Dear Chairman and Committee members

Paddock House site

I understand that the Committee will be discussing the plans for the housing to be developed on this site at tonight's meeting. Please can I urge you all to make a decision to proceed with the very much needed development of this site which has for far too long been a blight on the Town and more importantly has failed to provide the urgently needed low cost housing in the Town which this site could provide.

Now that Mid-Suffolk council has thankfully finally agreed to the revised receipt for the site and the scheme for 16 homes, any further delay in proceeding with this development is inexcusable. The long delay in making decisions about how to proceed with the development of the site is a disgrace and the Council should now ensure that it uses its very best efforts to drive forward with vigour and energy its development at the earliest possible opportunity.

The Housing Needs Survey has clearly demonstrated the need for low cost housing in Eye and the revised plan for 10 affordable shared-ownership homes and 6 for social rented homes will make a real contribution to meeting this urgent need for people on low incomes who so desperately need really affordable homes here, particularly in the light of the large amount of housing for sale that will be built through the approved plans for the development on the airfield site. There is a very real and urgent need for low cost housing in Eye which is having a detrimental effect on the Town. PLEASE DO NOT DELAY ANY FURTHER IN PROCEEDING WITH THIS DEVELOPMENT. We want to be proud of the Council in achieving this important step forward

to help people in need.

Yours

████████████████████

████ Church Street
Eye

PLANNING COMMITTEE



EYE TOWN COUNCIL

Appendix 03

Paddock House, Church Street, Eye,



To Eye Town Clerk



10:00

You replied to this message on 18/05/2020 10:03.

Good morning Wendy,

I have looked at the MSDC planning application for Paddock House and given the constraints, the application as currently presented is to be supported as I believe it represents the best way forward to hopefully bring a disappointing delay and eyesore to a satisfactory conclusion sooner rather than later. In so doing providing much needed affordable housing to Eye.

I would suggest some emphasis from ETC along the lines of local need rather than ending up with more deserving cases being shipped in from the wider LA area!

A black bar redacting the signature of the sender.