

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - 09 September 2015

---

**AGENDA ITEM NO** 1  
**APPLICATION NO** 4005/14  
**PROPOSAL** Erection of 44 dwellings together with associated garages, hardstanding drainage and infrastructure including new accesses  
**SITE LOCATION** Grove Farm, Queen Street, Stradbroke  
**SITE AREA (Ha)** 3.5  
**APPLICANT** Susan Webster, Jean Keeling and Peter Hillen  
**RECEIVED** January 7, 2015  
**EXPIRY DATE** June 3, 2015

---

**REASONS FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE**

The application is referred to committee for the following reason :

- (1) it is a "Major" application for:-
- a residential land allocation for 15 or over dwellings

**BACKGROUND**

1. The application was subject to pre application advice over an extended period of time and the proposal changed during this process a number of times developing from an exceptional affordable house scheme to a comprehensive scheme with both market homes and affordable units. The application was submitted just before Christmas 2014. During the course of the application the layout has been redesigned a number of times to improve in terms of SCC Highway requirements, reduce impact on the neighbour Listed Hall and reduce impact on the wider landscape. The most significant change was the need to reduce the site area and accordingly the number of dwellings proposed to 44 in order to safeguard an existing boundary hedge and avoid wider proposed impact.

**SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

2. Grove Farm is a Listed Building set adjacent to Queen Street, but does not form part of the site that consists of land to the north and east of the dwelling.

Essentially the proposal site is in three sections, the first is an area of various cattle sheds and outbuildings close to Queen Street where a road frontage is available. This is the point a new road and pedestrian access is proposed.

The second is the first of two small fields/paddocks divided by a native hedge and ditch that joins up the end of West Hall/Grove End housing estate with the

corner of a Moat serving Listed Stradbroke Hall. Along with the first section these areas of the site are located between the West Hall/Grove housing estate and share the north boundary and Stradbroke Hall and Grove Farm sharing the south boundary.

The third section is the field beyond the existing hedge that runs across the site. This area is characterised by open views and open to other fields not within this proposal. This is also the lowest point as the site slowly drops down to this area from the end of the main farmyard. This part of the site is beyond the built form of the existing settlement if you take the end point of the West Hall/ Grove End estate. The far east boundary of the site is tree lined and does guard against much wider landscape views beyond.

There are two barn conversions proposals, one within the first section and existing farm yard, the other is isolated from the main development area and located to the south and around the other side of Stradbroke Hall.

### HISTORY

3. The planning history relevant to the application site is:

4006/14	Works in order to form two barn conversions	Live Application
019675	Erection of a covered cattle yard	Granted 29/05/1975

### PROPOSAL

4. The proposal is for 44 dwellings (including two barn conversions) with new access and associated garages, hardstanding and drainage. The proposal includes an attenuation basin that also serves as public open space/community meadows.

Proposed are 4 x 1 bedroom dwellings; 12 x 2 bedroom dwellings; 17 x 3 bedroom dwellings; 10 x 4 bedroom dwellings and 1 x 5 bedroom dwelling and parking meets current standards, but exceeds these for some plots and uses a mix of tandem and parallel arrangements to provide both functional parking and avoid a car dominated development layout.

The 44 dwellings proposed excluding the attenuation basin and community meadows represents a density of approximately 21.6 dwellings per ha. (Including entire site with attenuation basin the development represents approximately 14 dwellings per ha). This is significantly below the CS9 provision of the Core Strategy that seeks an average of at least 30 dwellings, but that policy allows for special local circumstances that require a different treatment stating lower densities may be justified in villages to take account of the character and appearance of the existing built environment.

### POLICY

5. **Planning Policy Guidance**

See Appendix below.

**CONSULTATIONS**

6. **Stradbroke Parish Council (FULL)**

On 27Jul15, Stradbroke Parish Council convened its Planning Committee to consider the revised planning application 4005/14 for 44 dwellings at Grove Farm, Queens Street, Stradbroke. It voted in favour to recommended approval by 5 votes for, 4 against and one abstention.

However it was noted it was unclear as to the breakdown of the proposed affordable dwellings from the application and the village was in need for affordable homes, suitable housing to support young families joining and climbing the housing ladder.

**MOD (Statutory)**

No objections

**MSDC - Heritage (Summary)**

The Heritage Team considers that the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset because it would erode the rural setting and character of Grove Farmhouse and to a lesser degree Stradbroke Hall. The development should be weighed against public benefits of the proposal.

*Officer Note:- The report from Heritage is detailed and recommended to be read in full as attached in the bundle.*

**MSDC - Environmental Health - Land Contamination (Summary)**

Overall, I can confirm that I have no objections with respect to the application.

**MSDC - Environmental Health - Noise/Odour/Light/Smoke/Emissions (FULL)**

Noise from the proposed development could affect the amenity of the wider neighbourhood over the period of time it takes to complete. In order to minimise loss of amenity, I would recommend you consider a condition limiting the working hours during development to 07:30 - 18:00 hours Monday to Friday and 08:00 - 13:00 hours Saturday, with no work to take place on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

**MSDC - Tree Officer (Summary)**

Overall the layout seems to accommodate the majority of good quality trees although concerns remain regarding a number of 'pinch points' between retained trees and development e.g. plots 16 & 18 and tree T14. Of the trees scheduled for removal these are, with a few exceptions, generally of limited

amenity value and/or poor condition.

### **Suffolk County Council-Landscape Development Officer (Summary)**

In respect of amended plans, remains concerned with site frontage and loss of specific trees. Notes needs to potentially pipe watercourse near site frontage. Notes for east boundary development has been reduced and now maintains important hedge and watercourse, notes some harm may be cause to this hedge during construction and seeks more information on this area. For the north boundary notes potential future conflict between occupiers and some trees could result. Seeks more information on management of proposed community meadows.

Overall considers a better layout should be sought that draws development further away from boundaries. Should approval be sought has recommended conditions for landscaping to be agreed and materials.

### **Suffolk County Council - Highways**

Recommend conditions. Notes some parts of the estate would not be adopted without some small changes, but no objections. Seeks £4000 for improvements to bus stops and seeks securing of pedestrian crossing proposed.

The conditions recommended are.

- Details of new pedestrian crossing to be agreed and secure this provision (this would be secured by 106 as well)
- Secure access details and provision prior to occupation.
- Secure parking provision shown and retention
- Secure visibility splays and retention
- Details of bin storage
- Details of piping of ditches benefit new accesses
- Surface water drainage from highways to be agreed
- Secure Binder course level of construction for roads prior to occupation.
- Deliveries management plan (Note: This would be included in construction management plan)

### **MSDC - Strategic Housing (Summary)**

Following our discussion of today and review of the latest scheme plan I confirm that the overall layout, mix of dwelling types and sizes and tenures is now acceptable, to include 38% affordable housing. My only concern is that the affordable units meet the minimum space standards required for affordable dwellings.

### **Suffolk County Council - Senior Ecologist (Summary)**

Response highlights some errors in respect of trees given the changes in layout that have occurred during the course of the application, but concludes overall the proposed development is unlikely to have any significant impact on biodiversity subject to conditions. Recommends conditions to secure protected species licence (for barns), condition for lighting design, construction management that considers biodiversity, and ongoing management of biodiversity for the site for a five year period from first occupation.

### **Anglian Water (Summary)**

Confirms capacity for wastewater treatment and foul sewerage

### **The Environment Agency (Summary)**

Does not object to the proposal, including all revisions, but proposes a condition detailed in full below:-

#### *Condition*

*The development permitted by this planning permission shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment July 2014, prepared by Bingham Hall Associates and the following mitigation measures:*

*The scheme shall also include:*

- 1. Limiting the surface water run-off generated in all events up to the 1 in 100 year critical storm to no more than 5l/s, so that it will not exceed the run-off from the undeveloped site and not increase the risk of flooding off-site, in accordance with Appendix E and section 5.4 of the FRA.*
- 2. Provision of attenuation storage, sized and designed as per the calculations (Appendix E) and Drainage Strategy Plan (Appendix F) within the FRA to manage the volume of water generated in all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year return period event including allowances for climate change.*
- 3. The pipe diameters of the drainage network shall be determined during the detailed design stage and calculations shall be submitted which demonstrate they are sized to adequately convey the critical duration 1 in 100 year return period rainfall event, including allowances for climate change.*
- 4. In the event of exceedance flows that surpass the critical duration rainfall event or a blockage/failure occurs within the drainage network/flow control orifice the attenuation basin shall incorporate an emergency spillway and appropriate freeboard as part of its design.*
- 5. Confirmation that the existing drainage ditches, downstream to watercourse, are free from obstruction and able to adequately drain to watercourse without causing nuisance or damage. It is proposed that all surface water runoff generated from the proposed development will be discharged to existing drainage ditches via attenuation SuDS.*
- 6. All surface water management features must be designed in accordance with CIRIA (C697) The SuDS Manual so ecological, water quality and aesthetic benefits can be achieved in addition to the flood risk management benefits.*
- 7. Plans and drawings showing the locations and dimensions of all aspects of the proposed surface water management scheme. The submitted plans should demonstrate that the proposed drainage layout will perform as intended based on the topography of the site and the location of the proposed surface water management features. In addition, full design details, including cross sections of the proposed attenuation features will be required.*
- 8. Details of the future adoption and maintenance of all aspects of the surface water drainage strategy. The local planning authority should be satisfied that arrangements are in place for the long term maintenance and management of the surface water management scheme.*

*The mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and*

*subsequently in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme, or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the local planning authority.*

*Reason*

*To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of/disposal of surface water from the site in a range of rainfall events and ensure the system operates as designed for the lifetime of the development.*

### **SCC - Rights of Way Department (FULL)**

Please accept this email as confirmation that we have no comments or observations to make in respect of this application affecting any public rights of way.

### **Suffolk County Council - Corporate 106 Officer**

Sets out requirements for contributions towards library provision and waste. No contribution for education or early years as sufficient capacity exists in Stradbroke.

## **LOCAL AND THIRD PARTY REPRESENTATIONS**

7. This is a summary of the representations received.
- **Danger of children falling into Hall's moat.**
  - **Determent to setting of Moat and Hall.**
  - **Affects privacy of Hall.**
  - **Destroy character of the village, out of keeping development.**
  - **Increased risk of flooding.**
  - **Although reduced, proposal still provides for a very significant number of affordable homes.**
  - **Pleased with reduced scheme, but prefer more affordable proportion.**
  - **Needs more parking above standards.**
  - **Revised scheme remains too large (numbers)**
  - **Development has too many large houses that would be out of keeping.**
  - **Increases traffic to congested Queen Street, safety issues and needs traffic control.**
  - **Lack of infrastructure for the village.**
  - **Outside settlement boundary.**
- Other issues:- Affects house value of Stradbroke Hall, lorry movements in village, fear of becoming a town.**

## **ASSESSMENT**

8. There are a number of considerations which will be addressed as follows.
- Principle of Development
  - Compliance with Open Space and Social Infrastructure

- Compliance with Affordable Housing Policy
- Highway and Access Issues
- Design and Layout
- Listed Building and setting / Heritage Asset
- Residential Amenity
- Landscaping
- Biodiversity

● **PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT**

Five Year Land Supply

The NPPF states the District Council should have a 5 year land supply plus an appropriate buffer. As Members will be aware the housing land supply was recalculated for January 2015 and was calculated to be 4.2 years. On this basis Mid Suffolk does not have a 5 year housing land supply and the final year position is being calculated.

Given that Mid Suffolk cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing supply it is considered that Policy CS2 and the housing policies previously applied to this site including Local Plan policy H7 should be not considered to be up to date. The NPPF nevertheless requires that the development be considered to be sustainable in order to be acceptable.

**The Core Strategy and Core Strategy Focused Review (CSFR)**

Policy CS5 provides that *"All development will maintain and enhance the environment, including the historic environment, and retain the local distinctiveness of the area"*.

The Core Strategy Focused Review (CSFR) was adopted by Full Council on 20 December 2012 and should be read as a supplement to Mid Suffolk's adopted Core Strategy (2008). This document updates some of the policies of the 2008 Core Strategy. The document does introduce new policy considerations, including Policy FC 1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development that refers to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) objectives and Policy FC 1.1 - Mid Suffolk approach to delivering Sustainable Development that provides *"development proposals will be required to demonstrate the principles of sustainable development and will be assessed against the presumption in favour of sustainable development as interpreted and applied locally to the Mid Suffolk context through the policies and proposals of the Mid Suffolk new style Local Plan. Proposals for development must conserve and enhance the local character of the different parts of the district. They should demonstrate how the proposal addresses the context and key issues of the district and contributes to meeting the objectives and the policies of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy and other relevant documents."*

**NPPF**

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 27th March 2012. It provides that the NPPF "does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. Proposed development that accords with an up-to-date Local Plan should be approved, and proposed development that conflicts should be refused unless other

material considerations indicate otherwise".

The NPPF also provides (paragraph 187) that "Local planning authorities should look for solutions rather than problems, and decision-takers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible. Local planning authorities should work pro-actively with applicants to secure developments that improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area."

Section 7 of the NPPF refers to design. It provides that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development; it should contribute positively to making places better for people. Decisions should aim to ensure that development will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, establish a strong sense of place, create attractive and comfortable places to live, work and visit, optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development, create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses and support local facilities and transport networks. Furthermore it provides that development should respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation. The NPPF goes on to state it is "proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness" (paragraph 60) and permission should be "refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions" (paragraph 64).

### **NPPF - Supply of Housing**

The NPPF provides that Local Authorities should maintain a five year land supply for residential development. Para 49 goes on to provide

"Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites."

**In conclusion, the Council does not have a 5 year land supply, but the development is still required to be sustainable under the NPPF and not have adverse impacts that outweigh the benefit of development and these matters are considered further below.**

### **Other matters**

Stradbroke has initiated the process to develop a neighbourhood plan, but this is at initial stages and not adopted. There are no draft policies at this time and currently this document would have limited weight.

### **• COMPLIANCE WITH OPEN SPACE AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE**

The proposed development triggers the requirement to contribute to OSSI under policy CS6 of the Mid Suffolk LDF Core Strategy 2008 and the adopted SPD to provide open space and social infrastructure contributions and this proposed to be provided in full. However, CIL regulations that apply from 6th April 2015 now prevent general pooling of monies across the district and according instead these monies will be offer only for projects in respect of Stradbroke Community centre and playing field to mitigate the direct burden of the development



proposal.

The development also will contribute in full towards library provision in Stradbroke at Suffolk County Council's request. No education contribution has been sought.

#### ● **COMPLIANCE WITH AFFORDABLE HOUSING POLICY**

The proposed development initially sought to provide 50% affordable housing provision, however the size of development was considered to have a detrimental impact on the wider landscape and moated Hall setting and reduced.

At the same time viability assessments carried out by your Viability Officers concluded that the viability of such high affordable house provision would not work and likely lead to re-negotiation of terms once permission was granted. Working with the applicant the viability was assessed and 38.6% (17 units) affordable homes are recommended to be secured. This percentage exceeds current policy requirements of up to 35% (eg proposal exceeds policy by two units).

#### ● **HIGHWAY AND ACCESS ISSUES**

The proposed development replaces a farmstead and associated traffic. There would be a net gain in traffic onto Queen Street, but with the provision of a new pedestrian crossing and bus stop improvements SCC Highways authority have supported the development and considered the impact to be acceptable. The provision of parking within the scheme meets current parking standards and in some plots is allowance for extra provision on the driveways shown.

#### ● **DESIGN AND LAYOUT**

During the course of the application the layout has altered a number of times and included the reduction of proposed dwellings from 54 to 44. Initially the development proposed to spill out, removing a hedge and ditch and exceeding this existing boundary. This was considered by officers to have a detrimental impact on the wider landscape, represent encroachment and increased the urbanising enclosure of the moated Listed Hall to the south. The revised scheme is considered to resolve these points and maintains this boundary, but as a consequence a number of dwellings were removed.

The revised layout before members consists of frontage development and new footpath leading to a new pedestrian crossing. Traditional style buildings are proposed along the frontage and these have been amended during the course of the application to be more in keeping with the scale and design of the character of the area. Part of the frontage will be the conversion of an existing barn maintaining in part the rural history of the site. A single road serves as access for all proposed dwellings and this must comply with adoptable road standards as well as balance the need for a rural feel. The development offers a range of dwellings in design and size that are placed informally along the proposed access road.

The layout is very low in density overall, but at the same time has different areas of density within the layout. For example around Grove Farm House (Listed) the barn conversion and two plots adjacent are very spacious to respect the setting of the farm. Plots 5-9, 11 and 25 are equally designed with large gardens and

maintain a good distance from the northern boundary and existing neighbouring dwellings. There are five plots that back onto the southern boundary and moat, but have wide gardens and given the number and width of gardens would not overly subdivide the boundary. The higher density area of the site is located in the north east corner where constraints of Listed Building settings, frontage, conservation area and neighbouring dwellings are less influential. On balance the layout is considered to deal with the constraints of the surrounding boundaries.

#### **• LISTED BUILDING AND SETTING / HERITAGE ASSET**

The Local Plan under policy HB1 places a high priority on protecting historic buildings. Under the NPPF Para 17 states development should “*conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations*”. Para 131 goes on to provide that “*In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of; the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.*” Furthermore Para 132 states “*When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification.*”

In this case the Council's Heritage officer has assessed the development to cause less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset and refers to the need for public benefit to outweigh such harm. On the issue of public benefit the proposed heads of terms now meet sought contributions and requirements up to the expected policy level for any normal development. The development also goes on to provide benefits in terms of exceeding policy requirements for affordable housing, improvement works to Queen Street to benefit all users and provision of on site public open space that is secured. The effect of the Council's position on 5 year supply does result in the weight attached to housing supply as a material consideration of wider public benefit and need for such housing being significantly increased.

On balance the current application is agreed by all parties to cause less than substantial harm and while this is harm that impacts the character and appearance of the area and setting of Grove Farm and Stradbroke Hall there is sufficient public benefit including the delivery of housing land to outweigh said harm.

#### **• RESIDENTIAL AMENITY**

Policies within the adopted development plan require, inter alia, that development does not materially or detrimentally affect the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. It is considered that this proposal does not give rise to any unacceptable concerns of loss of neighbour amenity by

reason of separation distance, form and design.

### **• LANDSCAPING**

While the site in plan form fits well within the built form of Stradbroke, the landscape will be altered as this is a development of 44 dwellings on a site outside the settlement boundary. Significant changes to the layout have led to the reduction of the scheme to ensure the protection of the existing hedge boundary and separation of the site from wider landscape impact. Concerns remain from the Suffolk Council's Landscape Officer who would prefer further revised layout to allow more space and move proposed dwellings away from all boundaries and to achieve this it is likely further housing reduction would be required. The scheme proposed will lead to the loss of a number of trees, but none are protected and could be removed without consent. Suitable protection is conditioned during construction, but in some instances there might be desired removal that is considered acceptable against the overall benefit of the scheme. On the whole beyond safeguarding the wider landscape impact and setting of the moated Hall it is not considered that there are significant landscape matters that outweighs the benefit of housing and suitability of development on this site against the growth agenda.

### **• BIODIVERSITY**

Regulation 9(5) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (Implemented 1st April 2010) provides that all "competent authorities" (public bodies) to "have regard to the Habitats Directive in the exercise of its functions." In order for a Local Planning Authority to comply with regulation 9(5) it must "engage" with the provisions of the Habitats Directive. It is recognised that bats are present within the area and suitable mitigation is required. Conditions recommended by the county ecologist on this basis.

### **• SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL**

Mid Suffolk District Council does not currently have a 5 year housing land supply and on this basis the Housing policies in the Core Strategy and Focused Review at this time should not be considered as up to date. With consideration of the NPPF with the level of mitigation proposed for the burden of the proposed development, the development is considered to be sustainable and of public benefit sufficiently to outweigh identified harm.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

**That authority be delegated to The Corporate Manager for Development Management to grant planning permission subject to the prior completion of a Section 106 on terms to his satisfaction to secure the following matters and that such permission be subject to the conditions as set out below:-**

- 1) £4000.00 for improvements to bus stops in the local area.**
- 2) £9504.00 contribution towards Library services in Stradbroke only.**
- 3) £2244.00 waste contribution to SCC**
- 4) Provision of on site informal open space and public access (Community Meadow)**
- 5) OSS contribution of £289,509.90 to the extension of community centre and current playing fields in Stradbroke**

- 6) 38.6% affordable housing (mix of local needs and social association)
- 7) Phasing of development to be agreed
- 8) Provision of road improvements to Queen Street, including pedestrian crossing (type to be agreed)

and the following conditions:-

- Standard Time Limit
- Approved Plans
- Secure protected species licence (for barns)
- Condition for lighting design with consideration of biodiversity
- Construction management scheme + biodiversity management during construction
- Working hours during development to 07:30 - 18:00 hours Monday to Friday and 08:00 - 13:00 hours Saturday, with no work to take place on Sundays or Bank Holidays.
- Ongoing management of biodiversity issues for the site for a five year period from first occupation.
- Open space management to be agreed.
- Materials to be agreed
- Surfacing materials to be agreed and to take into account tree and hedgerow root systems
- Notwithstanding details submitted, landscaping details to be agreed.
- Tree protection measures and provision of Arboricultural Impact Assessment/ Arboricultural Method Statement to be agreed.
- Arboricultural monitoring to take place during construction.
- Highways: Details of new pedestrian crossing to be agreed and secure this provision
- Highways: Secure access details and provision prior to occupation.
- Highways: Secure parking provision shown and retention
- Highways: Secure visibility splays and retention
- Highways: Details of bin storage
- Highways: Details of piping of ditches benefit new accesses
- Highways: Surface water drainage from highways to be agreed
- Highways: Secure Binder course level of construction for roads prior to occupation.
- Condition recommended by EA as detailed in full earlier in this report.
- Foul and Surface water drainage TBA.

Philip Isbell  
Corporate Manager - Development Management

John Pateman-Gee  
Senior Planning Officer

## **APPENDIX A - PLANNING POLICIES**

### **1. Mid Suffolk Core Strategy Development Plan Document and the Core Strategy Focused Review**

- Cor1** - CS1 Settlement Hierarchy
- Cor2** - CS2 Development in the Countryside & Countryside Villages
- Cor5** - CS5 Mid Suffolks Environment
- Cor6** - CS6 Services and Infrastructure
- CSFR-FC1** - PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

**CSFR-FC1.1 - MID SUFFOLK APPROACH TO DELIVERING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

**CSFR-FC2 - PROVISION AND DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING**

## 2. Mid Suffolk Local Plan

**HB9 - CONTROLLING DEMOLITION IN CONSERVATION AREAS**

**H17 - KEEPING RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AWAY FROM POLLUTION**

**HB1 - PROTECTION OF HISTORIC BUILDINGS**

**HB8 - SAFEGUARDING THE CHARACTER OF CONSERVATION AREAS**

**GP1 - DESIGN AND LAYOUT OF DEVELOPMENT**

**CL8 - PROTECTING WILDLIFE HABITATS**

**HB13 - PROTECTING ANCIENT MONUMENTS**

**T10 - HIGHWAY CONSIDERATIONS IN DEVELOPMENT**

**H16 - PROTECTING EXISTING RESIDENTIAL AMENITY**

**H13 - DESIGN AND LAYOUT OF HOUSING DEVELOPMENT**

**H15 - DEVELOPMENT TO REFLECT LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS**

**H7 - RESTRICTING HOUSING DEVELOPMENT**

**H3 - HOUSING DEVELOPMENT IN VILLAGES**

**H4 - PROPORTION OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN NEW HOUSING DEVELOPMENT**

**H5 - AFFORDABLE HOUSING ON RURAL EXCEPTION SITES**

**HB3 - CONVERSIONS AND ALTERATIONS TO HISTORIC BUILDINGS**

**H9 - CONVERSION OF RURAL BUILDINGS TO DWELLINGS**

## 3. Planning Policy Statements, Circulars & Other policy

**NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework**

## **APPENDIX B - NEIGHBOUR REPRESENTATIONS**

Letters of representation have been received from a total of **20** interested parties.

The following people **objected** to the application

-----

|  
|  
The following people **supported** the application:

The following people **commented** on the application:  
|  
|