

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE -

AGENDA ITEM NO	1
APPLICATION NO	0294/15
PROPOSAL	Outline planning application with all matters reserved for residential development, comprising 40 dwellings with a new vehicular access off Thornham Road
SITE LOCATION	Land to the rear of West View Gardens, Gislingham
SITE AREA (Ha)	2
APPLICANT	New Hall Properties (Eastern) Ltd
RECEIVED	January 26, 2015
EXPIRY DATE	July 28, 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

PRE-APPLICATION ADVICE

1. Pre-application advice was given that the site was outside of the settlement boundary of Gislingham and therefore Policy CS2 of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy would apply. However the provisions of the NPPF in relation to a lack of 5 year supply would also need to be considered. Further advice was given that if additional residential development was required the site was a logical extension of the village.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

2. The site is located adjacent to the settlement boundary of Gislingham and is surrounded on three sides by residential development. The site is accessed off Thornham Road. The majority of the site is an arable field, the east of the site is grassland with a number of trees located within it, including a veteran Oak tree which is protected by a TPO with an adjacent pond. To the south east of the site, within the same ownership, is a large copse of trees with a informal footpath through it.

Within the site are two public footpaths, the first of these cuts through the top of the site from Thornham Road to West View Gardens. The second bisects the site from Coldham Lane to Church Farm and then through to the Church.

The northern boundary of the side is partly adjacent to Thornham Road with a

mixed hedgerow and partly backs onto properties with Long Meadows and Church Farm, a Grade II listed building. Further to the north is St Mary's church a Grade I listed building.

The eastern boundary of the site comprises a tree belt and beyond this open countryside. The southern boundary comprises the rear gardens of dwellings located on Coldham Lane and the western boundary the rear garden of dwellings on West View Gardens and Spring Close.

HISTORY

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

None relevant

PROPOSAL

4. The application is for outline permission with all matters reserved for 40 dwellings and a new vehicular access off Thornham Road. 36 dwellings are proposed to be market dwellings and 4 affordable dwellings (10%). An indicative layout has been provided showing the new dwellings accessed off a spine road from Thornham Road, with smaller private drives to clusters of houses. The indicative master plans shows a low density development of 14.5 dwellings per hectare with significant public open space. Public Open Space would be located to the front of the site, which would include the public footpath and TPO tree within it. A further area of public open space would be located in the centre of the site, alongside the public footpath. The copse outside of the site is also indicated as public open space.

The original application was for a slightly smaller part of the site with an arbitrary dividing line through the field. Following consultation responses from County Highways and the Landscape Officer, the proposal was altered to include the majority of the field (except for the copse) but the number of houses remained the same.

POLICY

5. **Planning Policy Guidance**

See Appendix below.

CONSULTATIONS

6. **Parish Council**

Object to the proposal for the following reasons:

- Development is on a Greenfield site which has been used for agriculture. It is outside the settlement boundary. The development is therefore contrary to Policy.
- Gislingham is a Primary Village deemed capable of limited growth where

local need has been established. This level of development should be aimed at Key Service Centres not Primary Villages.

- Under CS1 development outside the settlement boundaries is only allowed by allocation in the Site Specific Allocation document, to sites adjacent to settlement boundaries. This land has not been identified in this document.
- There is no established local need. Very few of the houses on the Chapel Farm site have been bought. Building has now stopped because of lack of up take. Gisleingham Parish Plan 2011 gave a further strong indication that there is not local need, with 66% wanting to further development.
- This is not sustainable development by any definition
- The infrastructure is not in place to support this kind of expansion of the village. Both the primary and secondary school are close to capacity.
- The transport Statement provided is inaccurate. Number of journeys projected is very low, not all traffic will exit the village in the direction of the A140, bus use is impractical. Contrary to MSDC policy on reducing traffic and carbon emissions by locating new housing near adequate employment and transport links.
- Out of scale and character of development
- Gisleingham has seen significant growth in the last 20 years, no matched improvement to services and infrastructure.
- If the application is approved nothing to stop the wholesale use of Greenfield sites across the District making a significant impact on the rural nature of Mid Suffolk and changing its character irrevocably.

Ramblers

Object to development as no provision for the public footpaths within the site.

Suffolk Fire and Rescue

No objections, require condition relating to hydrants

Arboricultural Officer

Initial comments - limited arboricultural impact. Some trees located on perimeter but can be protected by condition relating to fencing during construction.

Natural England

No objection in relation to statutory nature conservation sites.

Suffolk County Council: Archeology

Proposed development affects an area of archaeological potential, recommend condition relating to archaeological works

Mid Suffolk District Council Environmental Health

Recommend condition relating to land contamination

Suffolk County Council: Rights of Way

Public footpaths 32 and 33 are recorded through the proposed development site

and Public Footpath 61 is recorded adjacent to it.

- where the access road crosses the footpaths will require suitable crossing points, signage and dropped kerbs
- need to ensure that the public footpaths are not obstructed
- Need to ensure where footpaths go through public open space a minimum 2.5 width be provided for the route of the footpath

English Heritage

Do not wish to offer comments

Environment Agency

No objection, land is located in Flood Zone 1 which is low flood probability. Recommend conditions relating to surface water drainage, water, energy and resource efficiency measures, rainwater harvesting and foul sewerage.

Anglian water

Foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Gislingham Water Recycling Centre, which currently does not have capacity to treat the flows from the development site. Anglian Water are obligated to accept the foul flows from development with the benefit of planning consent and would therefore take the necessary steps to ensure that there is sufficient treatment capacity .

Mid Suffolk District Council Strategic Housing:

As a greenfield site there should not be any notable viability issues if the appropriate land value is applied. The land is currently agricultural land and the value should reflect this.

The applicant has raised the issue of the Mid Suffolk land supply - whilst the NPPF is the primary considerations in such cases, local policies should still be given some weight and not disregarded as a sustainable development is a key issue for the Council to consider. The inclusion of an appropriate level of affordable housing (35%) forms part of what makes a sustainable development.

Suffolk Preservation Society

Acknowledged that there is no 5 year supply in place therefore the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies. However paragraph 14 of the NPPF states that this means granting permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. Proposal is too large for the village to easily absorb especially when taking in conjunction with other recent development. Development on the edge of the village will neither conserve nor make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. There is no heritage statement despite the site location adjacent to St Mary's Church and Church Farmhouse. Proposal would have a detrimental impact on the setting of the Grade I listed St Mary's Church and Grade II listed Church Farmhouse as it change the pastoral approach towards the churchyard. It would harm the significant of the heritage assets by changing

their setting from rural to suburban. The proposal does not address the specific needs of the community, smaller homes for young and elderly residents.

Suffolk County Council S106 contributions

Education: local catchment schools are Gislingham CEVCP School and Hartismere High School. There are insufficient school places available at all levels and the following contributions totalling £290,109 would be required.

Primary school 10 pupils = £121,810

Secondary school 7 pupils = £126,485

Sixth form 2 pupils = £39,814

Pre-school provision: Up to 4 pre-school pupils arising at a cost of £6,091 per place. In Gislingham there is 1 provider offering 48 places, there are currently 5 spaces available across the week, therefore no contribution is sought.

Highways: In order to create two new bus stops of Thornham Road £4,000 is sought.

Rights of Way: Gislingham Public Footpath no. 32 passes through the proposed site and as a result of the anticipated use of the public right of way network the Rights of Way service is looking to improve these routes. To encourage residents of the proposal to walk to Thornham Magna and in particular Thornham Park look for funding a safe off road route at a cost of £10,370.

Libraries: Capital contribution towards the development of library services arising from this scheme is $216 \times 40 = £8,640$. This would be spend at the local catchment library of Eye.

Waste: Request a contribution of £51 per dwelling towards waste disposal facilities, this would be a capital contribution of £2,040.

County Highways

Initial comments: As currently show the proposed access and layout is not acceptable. The new access road and junction need to meet Thorndon Road at a 90 degree angle. There needs to be a greater stagger between the new junction and that of Columbine Way. There is only one foot way of Thorndon Road and this is opposite the site. It is not possible to provide a suitable crossing due to the junction with Columbine Way. The locations of proposed plots 1 and 2 blocks the route of the existing public footpath. Larger junction radii are required for the new access onto Thorndon Road.

Subsequent comments: No objection to the changes to the site outline.

Suffolk Wildlife Trust

A number of bat roosts have been recorded in the vicinity of this site include in the church a short distance to the north. It must therefore be ensured that the development in this location does not result in an adverse impact on such activity and in order to provide enhanced habitat significant structural landscape planting should be include along the site boundaries. At present the Site Masterplan does not appear to include such landscape planting. Also a sensitive lighting scheme which ensures that there is not lighting of area of

vegetation must be incorporated in to the design of the development. We request that the recommendations for mitigation and enhancement within the report are implemented in full, via a condition

MSDC Heritage

The Heritage Team considers that the proposal would cause

- less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset because it will detach the listed farmhouse from its wider rural setting; however, the degree of harm is limited, as explained below.

The Heritage Team recommends that this harm be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme.

To the north of the site stand the listed Church and Church Farmhouse. The churchyard is enclosed to the south by residential development and the grounds of Church Farmhouse. The churchyard has a secluded character, and the setting of the Church is not materially affected by the proposal.

Church Farmhouse has a long garden enclosed at the south by tall conifer hedging. The site beyond is presumed to have a historical connection with the farmhouse, adding something to its significance, but this is compromised by the seclusion of the garden, and by the enclosure of the field by housing development to the west and south. Accordingly the contribution of the site to the significance of the listed building is quite limited.

MSDC Landscape

The site field is reasonably enclosed from surrounding views by existing housing on its west, north and southern boundaries. There are glimpsed views of the field from the north, the Mellis Road and from the south, the lane to Spring Farm. There will be views of the site from the Thornham Road when travelling into/out of the village from the east and west.

The Thornham Road site frontage is well hedged although there would be some benefits in removing some poorer trees and ornamental hedge species such as laurel and carry out some replanting.

The application is in outline with an indicative layout shown on a LAP Plan 7965/LOC 01. The site area has been expanded over the initial planning application to include the whole of the site field. This offers the potential of providing a more comprehensive site layout and particularly an improved highway access and landscape treatment. The suggested site layout currently indicates that it will be possible to achieve some positive aspects such as:

- Generous open space area in the centre of the site, this could include play space.
- An amenity public open space next to the road which appears to encapsulate the veteran oak and pond.
- Provision for the inclusion of the two public footpaths crossing the site.
- Provision for the inclusion of open space next to some of the existing residential boundaries

I am satisfied that development in this location and subject to good architectural, layout and landscape design would not have an unduly detrimental impact on the wider landscape. There will be local impacts on residential property and residents, this would need to be minimised through good design. The site can offer some benefits in terms of public green space.

Viability Officer

Have considered the assumptions set out in the appraisals. Consider the sale values set as suggested by the applicants are too low, partly due to very low values used for the sale of the affordable housing. Land values suggested are too high, at £164,000 per hectare compared with a general land value within the district of £100,000. Build values are also too high. Using the Council's values the viability of the proposed development is financially feasible and can afford a total of 35% affordable housing.

LOCAL AND THIRD PARTY REPRESENTATIONS

7. This is a summary of the representations received.
- **Use of greenfield site**
 - **Loss of views**
 - **Highway impact due to additional vehicles**
 - **Impact on footpaths**
 - **Impact on primary and secondary school**
 - **Currently new houses being build in Gislingham which have not been sold**
 - **Development will set a precedent for other Greenfield sites in Gislingham**
 - **Impact on biodiversity particularly bats**
 - **Noise and disturbance to neighbouring dwellings during construction**
 - **Impact on house prices**
 - **No smaller dwellings for younger people to buy**
 - **Impact on drains and sewerage**
 - **Impact from light pollution**
 - **Development out of scale**
 - **No local need for additional dwellings**
 - **Parish Plan shows no desire for additional dwellings in the village**
 - **Very limited employment opportunities within village**
 - **Inadequate public transport**
 - **Loss of agricultural land**
 - **Lack of affordable housing**
 - **Land is vulnerable to surface water flooding**
 - **Design will be out of keeping with the village**
 - **Loss of privacy**
 - **There is alternative development elsewhere**
 - **The FRA includes significant inaccuracies**
 - **Not a sustainable development due to lack of local facilities**
 - **Suffering nationwide housing shortage**
 - **Provide opportunity for people to stay local**
 - **Planning obligations will improve services**
 - **Larger scale development is required to provide smaller dwellings for local first time buyers**

ASSESSMENT

8. Principle of Development.

The site is located outside of the settlement boundary of Gislingham. As such the site is located within the Countryside where Policy CS2 of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy applies. This states that development in the Countryside will be limited to various categories of development. Market residential dwellings are not one of the categories of development acceptable in the Countryside and therefore the proposal would not comply with Policy CS2.

The NPPF states that if a development plan is not up to date or in compliance with the NPPF it can be set aside to allow sustainable development. In particular paragraph 49 of the NPPF states that

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.

The NPPF states that all districts should have a 5 year land supply plus an appropriate buffer. Mid Suffolk's land supply was last calculated in January 2015 at 4.2 years.

Given that Mid Suffolk cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing supply it is considered that Policy CS2 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. In addition Paragraph 12 states that:

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.

Impact on the character and appearance of the area

Policy CS5 of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy 2008 emphasises that all development must reflect local distinctiveness and enhance the character and appearance of the district. Policy FC 1.1 of the Core Strategy Focus Review 2012 states that development must conserve or enhance the local character of the different parts of the district. Policy GP1 states to be supported all proposals should maintain or enhance the character of the surrounding area and should respect the scale and density of surrounding development.

The character of Gislingham is that of a village which has evolved organically through time. There are a range of types and densities of residential developments. This includes denser housing estates at Broadfields and West

View Gardens. The proposed estate type development is therefore not out of character with the village and the low density development reflects the rural character of the area. The location of the site adjacent to similar development within the denser part of the village provides a logical extension to the village and would not create further linear development.

The scale of the development, at 40 houses, is larger than previous developments but it does not dwarf the village and the site is so well contained that any artificial sub division of the site, to provide a smaller scale development, would be more detrimental to the character of the area.

The site is very well contained, with residential development on three sides and the eastern side contained by a strong hedge and tree line. The wider landscape impacts will therefore be minimal and the landscape officer has not objected to the proposals.

Highways and transport

Saved Policies H13 and T10 of the Mid Suffolk District Local Plan states that development will be supported where it does not have a negative impact on highway safety. The policies referred to above are in line with the requirement of paragraph 39 of the NPPF to provide safe and suitable access for all and carries significant weight the determination of this application.

Access is a reserved matter, but the indicative layout shows the access from Thornham Road through the centre of the site. This would provide adequate viability splays and would not conflict with the access to Columbine Way. The Highway Authority has not objected to the proposed development. Although there have been objections in relation to the capacity of the local highway network to take additional traffic, the Local Highway Authority has not suggested that this is an issue.

Impact on Heritage Assets

Policy CS5 of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy states that the Council will protect, conserve and where possible enhance the natural and built historic environment. Policy FC1.1 of the Core Strategy Focus Review states that development must conserve and enhance the local character of different parts of the district which would include preserving heritage assets.

The policies referred to above are in line with paragraph 132 of the NPPF which states that the Significance of a heritage asset can be harmed through development within its setting and carries significant weight the determination of this application.

There are two listed buildings in close proximity to the site, Church Farmhouse which is Grade II listed and St Mary's Church which is Grade 1 listed. Both of these are located on Thornham Road. Church Farmhouse has a large rear garden which is well hedged, the dwelling is located approximately 56 metres from the edge of the site. St Mary's Church is separated from the site by the garden of Church Farmhouse and the treed church yard. The settling of the Church has already been effected by the development of West View Gardens and it is a distance of approximately 73 metres from the site.

The Heritage Officer has stated that the development would have less than substantial harm on the setting of the heritage assets. As such this would need to be weighted up by the public benefits. These would include additional housing, including affordable housing, and the provision of public open space. Given the minimal harm it is considered if the significant public benefits were achieved these would outweigh the less than substantial harm to the heritage assets.

Residential Amenity

Saved Policies SB2, H13 and H16 of the Mid Suffolk District Local Plan aim to protect the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. These policies are considered to have significant weight in the determination of this application as they do not conflict with the main thrust of the NPPF as stated in paragraph 215 of the NPPF.

Properties on Thornham Road, West View Gardens and Coldham Lane would all be potentially affected by the proposed development. In particular Meadow View and The Ley are located close to the boundary of the development and West View Gardens are bungalows with small rear gardens. The application is outline and given the low density of the development is considered that an acceptable scheme which would prevent the loss of residential amenity can be brought forward at reserved matters if the application is approved. In particular it may be necessary to include bungalows close to the properties on West View Gardens.

Affordable Housing

Altered Policy H4 of the Mid Suffolk Local Plan states that up to 35% of dwellings on new developments should be for affordable housing needs. This policy is in accordance with the aim of the NPPF to provide residential development for different sectors of the community.

The proposed development would provide 10% affordable housing (4 dwellings) which is substantially less that would be expected under policy H4. The developers have provided viability information to show that the scheme would not be viable with a higher percentage of housing but these calculations are disputed.

In particular the developers have stated that the value of the land at £164,000 per hectare which is much higher that the generally accepted land value for Mid Suffolk and Babergh which is £100,000 per acre (this value has been agreed by other developers and tested by the District Valuer for other sites). The site is currently an agricultural field without planning permission and there are no significant arbnormals to explain the high land value. In addition the developers have included very low sales values for the affordable housing and higher than normal build costs, with little explanation for these costs.

There is a significant need for affordable housing within the district which this proposal would not meet. Nor have the developers shown that the site would be unviable if a 35% affordable housing level was required. The development therefore does not comply with altered Policy H4 of the Mid Suffolk Local Plan.

Biodiversity

Policy CS5 of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy states that development should protect, manage and enhance Mid Suffolk's biodiversity. This policy is in accordance with paragraph 109 of the NPPF states that development should minimise impacts on biodiversity and provide net gains in biodiversity where possible. A biodiversity phase 1 survey has been provided which shows that the current site has limited habitats for protected species due to its use as a intensively managed arable field. There are known bat roosts at the adjacent church. The copse of trees outside of the site and the TPO veteran oak tree are considered to be more favourable habitats, especially for bats but these are intended to be retained. The indicative layout shows the oak tree surrounded by public open space.

The biodiversity phase 1 survey recommends various enhancement measures including supplementing existing native hedges, bird and bat boxes and sensitive lighting schemes. Suffolk Wildlife Trust has no objections to the proposed development subject to additional landscaping and mitigation measures.

Drainage and flooding

The site is reported by local representation to suffer from poor drainage and has suffered from standing water in the past. As such the proposal will need to consider surface water drainage carefully. The submitted scheme proposes the use of existing ditches and infiltration areas. The Environment Agency has questioned the capacity of the site to store surface water and ensure that a greenfield runoff rate is retained. Additional information has been received from developer to show that the surface water could be stored using porous driveways and attenuation basins/swale's. There is sufficient public open space to provide for such features.

S.106 Planning Obligations

Policy CS6 of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy states that new development will be expected to provide or support the delivery of appropriate and accessible infrastructure to meet the justifiable needs of new development. S.106 contributions have been requested as follows:

- Primary and Secondary Education - £288,108
- Libraries - £8,640
- Waste - £2,040
- Rights of Way improvements - £10,370
- Bus Stop improvements - £4,00
- Community facilities - £100,000

Due to the implementation of the CIL regulations the Council can no longer require contributions for facilities which has previously received more than five contributions, unless specified within the s.106 agreement. As such contributions to the schools will be acceptable provided they are named, but general OSSI contributions are no longer acceptable. However the development, if approved, will have an impact on community facilities and this impact should be mitigated for. In the case of Gislingham a contribution of £100,000 is proposed towards a replacement of the Silver Band Hut. This contribution would be acceptable under the CIL regulations as the Silver Band

Hut has not previously received pooled contributions. The project to replace the Silver Band Hut is well advanced and is likely to be able to be delivered within an acceptable timescale.

Balancing Exercise

Paragraph 49 of the NPPF states that where it cannot be demonstrated that a district has a five year land supply there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This is echoed by the Core Strategy Focus Review. It is therefore necessary to weight up the scheme to consider if the proposed development would be sustainable. Paragraph 7 of the NPPF suggests that there are three aspects of sustainability which should be considered, economic, social and environmental.

The major benefit of the proposal would be the addition of 40 dwellings to current permissions which would contribute to the supply of dwellings in the District. However the dwellings would only contribute to the supply of dwellings if they are delivered. The need for additional dwellings in Gislingham has been questioned, particularly given that another new development, The Paddocks has sold slowly. The Paddocks is a scheme of 23 dwellings with all but two of the market dwellings being 4 bed detached houses at the upper end of the market.

The proposed development at Land to the rear of West View Gardens would be more mixed with 24 three bed houses and 16 four bed houses as part of a larger estate. As such, the proposed development is likely to be less expensive and will therefore attract a different market to The Paddocks development. Ultimately market forces will dictate what if any development occurs and if no there is no market for additional dwellings in Gislingham, a house builder will not choose to acquire the site.

The development of 40 dwellings would have some economic benefits particularly during the construction phase. In addition the occupiers of the dwellings will use the shops and other facilities within Gislingham, although these facilities are limited and most spend will be elsewhere. There are very limited employment uses within Gislingham, again decreasing the economic benefits of the development.

The proposed development, would be outside of the settlement boundary, the sustainability of Gislingham can be questioned; Gislingham is a primary village where the core strategy suggests that limited housing should take place. The facilities in Gislingham are limited; there is a shop, primary school, pub and various community facilities. However the village is relatively isolated from larger towns and villages, where in particular employment facilities are located. In addition the public transport is limited. The occupants of the dwellings are therefore likely to be car dependent if they are in employment. The nearest towns are Eye and Diss, approximately 5.7 miles and 8.8 miles distant.

The social role of sustainable development also needs to consider the effect the development will have on the local infrastructure. The developer has indicated a willingness to contribute to schools, libraries and waste facilities. Both the primary and secondary school in Gislingham appear to be at capacity, however the primary school has in the last few years taken many children who live outside of the catchment area. Both the schools appear to be capable of physically expanding to take further children. Although an affordable housing

contribution has been offered, this would only provide 10% affordable housing. Without an s.106 obligation covering essential infrastructure including a reasonable rate of affordable housing, the development should not be considered to be sustainable.

With regards to the broader environmental aspects of sustainability, in relation to protecting and enhancing the natural, built and historic environment, the proposal would have a less than substantial impact on the setting of the Grade II Listed Church Farmhouse and also the Grade I Listed St Mary's Church, however this is at the lower end of harm and would be outweighed by the public benefits of additional dwellings in the district, some affordable housing and public open space.

The development would have limited impact on the natural environment. The site is well related to the settlement boundary and as it is well contained would have limited landscape impacts. The current site has limited biodiversity and any effect on biodiversity can be mitigated for.

It is not considered that development of this site would not set a precedent for other development on greenfield sites in the village. Any development would need to be considered on its own merits, but there are no other sites which are both well located to the centre of the village and well contained by other residential development.

CONCLUSION

This case is finely balanced; there are limited environmental impacts and there will be some economic benefits of the scheme. Although need for the development is questioned, there is no evidence that the dwellings are not required, particularly given Mid Suffolk's lack of a 5 year land supply.

Gislingham is a primary village which would provide everyday facilities. However the area lacks employment opportunities and suitable public transport. Therefore most occupiers would be reliant on private vehicles to access employment opportunities.

Given its relatively isolated location and lack of a wide range of facilities, Gislingham is only suitable for small scale growth. However this proposed scheme is small scale and is sequentially probably the most suitable location for development within the village.

The provision of additional market housing would contribute to the overall housing supply of the district, however there is also a significant need for affordable housing. The proposal would provide only 4 affordable dwellings (10%) significantly less than required under Altered policy H4. There is no evidence that the development would be undeliverable if 35% affordable housing was provided. The lack of affordable dwellings would result in an unsustainable development.

Given that there is no signed s.106 agreement for other infrastructure contributions this would be an additional reason to refuse that application.

RECOMMENDATION

- That Planning Permission be REFUSED for the following reason:
The proposal fails to make adequate provision/contributions (and/or agreement to provide) for community and other facilities/services for the occupants of the dwellings. The applicants have not entered in to the necessary legal agreement, which is required to ensure the following Community Infrastructure Requirements/Facilities are provided:
 - The provision of 35% of the dwellings as on site Affordable Housing,
 - Financial contributions towards Primary School & Secondary School Places, Libraries and Waste.
 - Financial contributions towards additional bus stops and improvements to the Public Right of Way network.
 - Contributions to Community Facilities in particular the Gislingham Silver Band Hut
 - A Management Plan to deal with the provision, maintenance and transfer of public open space.

Having regards to the absence of common ground on viability and the absence of a package of agreed section 106 obligations the proposal is therefore contrary to the NPPF and saved Policy CS6 and saved Altered Policy H4 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Local Plan First Alteration.

Philip Isbell
Corporate Manager - Development Management

Elizabeth Truscott
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
- CSFR-FC1** - PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
- CSFR-FC1.1** - MID SUFFOLK APPROACH TO DELIVERING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
- Cor5** - CS5 Mid Suffolks Environment

2. Mid Suffolk Local Plan

- HB1** - PROTECTION OF HISTORIC BUILDINGS
- CL8** - PROTECTING WILDLIFE HABITATS
- GP1** - DESIGN AND LAYOUT OF DEVELOPMENT
- RT12** - FOOTPATHS AND BRIDLEWAYS
- H16** - PROTECTING EXISTING RESIDENTIAL AMENITY
- H4** - PROPORTION OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN NEW HOUSING DEVELOPMENT
- H7** - RESTRICTING HOUSING DEVELOPMENT
- H15** - DEVELOPMENT TO REFLECT LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS
- H13** - DESIGN AND LAYOUT OF HOUSING DEVELOPMENT
- T10** - HIGHWAY CONSIDERATIONS IN DEVELOPMENT

3. Planning Policy Statements, Circulars & Other policy

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework
C01/03 - Safeguarding aerodromes, technical sites and military explos

APPENDIX B - NEIGHBOUR REPRESENTATIONS

Letter(s) of representation(s) have been received from a total of **86** interested party(ies).

The following people **objected** to the application

The following people **supported** the application:

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