

Chair's Report Full PC Meeting 160221

For Information:

1. Complaints follow up meeting with MSDC 26th January

Same group as previously.

MSDC have passed on the structure chart for Planning to the clerk so he can target questions and concerns to the appropriate officers.

We were introduced to John Pateman –Gee (JP-G) the area planning officer.

Counsel's response to the status of the NDP in relation to Post Mill Development, has been received by MSDC and they are revising some of their reports. Planning will be reviewed towards end of Feb. (However the Developer has put in an Appeal so this will amend the process.)

Discussion was had about the New Baptist Chapel Site. JP-G is visiting.

MSDC asked to explain to residents the outcomes of any decisions.

Discussion was had about the Scout headquarters. MSDC are going to investigate the status of the road onto the site and explore if key planning for drainage and water is in place.

It was also noted that our planning issues are similar to other Parishes.

We were asked if we would be prepared to meet with MSDC and SAFE together in the future.

2. Planning Saga Post Mill

As reported at the planning meeting an Appeal has been lodged by the Developers against a non-determination of the application. This will go through due process.

3. Minutes of the BMSDC Committee B for 25th November meeting (Post Mill application).

There was a minor grammatical amendment. Amendments/Additions were not permitted.

The vote was 1 abstention, 3 for approving 3 against approving and the chair's casting vote was to approve the minutes as a true record.

Recommendation

1. That the Council does not engage in pre-application discussion with prospective developers and that we reply with a statement:

We thank the applicant for asking for our opinions at an early stage in their development project. Although we are not able to openly discuss this with them because of matters of probity and expertise, we would like to direct them to the Neighbourhood Development Plan where the agreed Parish objectives and policies are set out. In particular we draw attention to the Housing Objectives. In addition we recommend that the prospective developer talks with Mid Suffolk District Council Planning Department about their proposal as they are the Local Planning Authority.... Contact details.....

I am proposing the above on the back of a recent application sent to all of us prior to it being submitted to the planning authority. We are not a planning authority; we are a consultee.

As much as we might like to support local developers or not, engaging in pre-submission discussions could put us in a compromising position:

1. We would be looking at the application twice- so doing the job twice.
2. We would have to be assured that the developer understood 100% that we could not make any decision about the application. Nor are we qualified to give technical or building advice.
3. We have an NDP which clearly states what sort of development has been agreed by the community. The Developer should be encouraged to read the NDP and if they have questions or concerns discuss these with the LPA. There is mechanism for doing this.
4. We might get ourselves into difficulties when a developer thinks that we support an application and then when presented with it from the LPA, we oppose it. This could lead to upset and unhappiness all round. There is a potential to fuel confusion which can spread through the community. Therefore it is in my view better to follow procedure and respond to applications when they come to us from the LPA.

DW