

1

**MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL  
PLANNING REFERRALS COMMITTEE - 18 MARCH 2015**

<b>AGENDA ITEM NO</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>APPLICATION NO</b>	<b>3310/14</b>
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Erection of 270 dwellings comprising 110 x two-bedroom houses, 135 x 3 bedroom houses and 25 x 4 bedroom houses and associated garaging/car parking, landscaping, public open space, play areas and access to Bramford Road, together with the construction of a convenience store with 6 x two-bedroom flats above, associated parking and servicing areas on land at Hackneys Corner.
<b>SITE LOCATION</b>	Land Between Gipping & Bramford Road, Great Blakenham
<b>SITE AREA (Ha)</b>	11.37
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Mr High Orbit Homes (2020) Limited
<b>RECEIVED</b>	October 27, 2014
<b>EXPIRY DATE</b>	January 26, 2015

**REASONS FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE**

The application is referred to committee for the following reasons:

- It is a "Major" application for a residential development for 15 or over dwellings;
- the Head of Economy considers the application to be of a controversial nature having regard to the location, scale and / or nature of the application; and
- the application is reported to Planning Referrals Committee with the agreement of the Chairman having regard to its strategic nature.

## PRE-APPLICATION ADVICE

This application follows a withdrawn appeal. "Without prejudice" Project Team advice has been given within the context of aiming to secure the delivery of a sustainable, viable and deliverable scheme for the remainder of the site that is not yet built out.

A scheme for approx. 270 dwellings, a local centre and public open space was proposed on the as yet unbuilt land as an alternative to the extant permission for the site. This included developing the area previously proposed as a school and commercial units for housing with a contribution to County for increasing school capacity at existing sites. Detailed and lengthy discussions and viability work lead to a revised Section 106 offer.

## SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The overall site granted planning permission for development under ref 2326/05 is located in the southern part of Great Blakenham. The site is bounded to the east by the railway line, to the north by Gipping Road, to the west by Bramford Road (B1113) and to the south by Chapel Lane. The site also included the sports pitches to the west of Bramford Road.

The current application is for part of the above site. This application site includes the land not yet developed, the open spaces partly provided on the overall site, the road network developed and to be developed on the overall site and the sports pitches to the west of Bramford Road.

The site is former cement works/MOD land that has been cleared and is therefore generally open in character apart from the housing that has been built. There is some vegetation around some of the edges of the site. At the time of writing this report 126 dwellings have been constructed and occupied and up to a further 30 are under construction. The land slopes markedly from southwest down towards Gipping Road. The sports ground is generally open and undeveloped in nature and currently used by football and bowls clubs.

In terms of its wider location context the site lies near A14, a major route between Felixstowe and the Midlands. As a consequence this part of the Gipping Valley has witnessed high levels of urbanisation, with the introduction of minerals / waste operations along with large scale employment and housing growth.

HISTORY

3. The planning history relevant to the application site is set out below. Key items are in **bold**.

	<u>The application site</u>	
3882/14	Non-material amendment sought following planning permission 3496/13 "Erection of 24 dwellings comprising 1-two bedroom flat, 8-two bedroom houses, 14-three bedroom houses and 1-four bedroom house together with garaging and car parking [substitution of house types to plots 31-38 and 239-255 as approved under Reserved Matters Reference 3489/09]" in order to make a substitution of materials and finishes to Denton house type on plots 243 and 247.	Granted January 2014
2179/14	Application for a non-material amendment following grant of planning permission 3498/13, (Erection of 24 dwellings) to change house plot 242 to house type Sandhurst.	Granted
0242/14	Erection of 194 dwellings comprising 68 two-bedroom, 101 three-bedroom and 24 four-bedroom dwellings together with associated garaging, car parking, landscaping and access.	Invalid
3496/13	Erection of 24 dwellings comprising 1 two-bedroom flat, 8 two-bedroom houses, 14 three-bedroom houses and 1 four-bedroom house together with garaging and car parking [Substitution of house types to plots 31-38 and 239-255 as approved under Reserved Matters Reference 3489/09]	Granted
3066/13	Erection of 194 dwellings comprising 68 two-bedroom, 101-three bedroom and 24 four-bedroom dwellings together with associated garaging, car parking, landscaping and access.	Appeal withdrawn
2943/13	Erection 8 dwellings comprising 2 three-bedroom dwellings and 2 two-bedroom dwellings together with garaging and car parking (substitution of house types to plots 31-38 as approved under reserved matters reference 3489/09)	Withdrawn
2344/13	Erection of 16 dwellings comprising 3 two-bedroom dwellings, 12 three-bedroom dwellings and 1 four-bedroom dwelling together with associated garaging and car parking. (Substitution of house types to plots 239-255 as	Refused

approved under reserved matters approval 3489/09).

0715/12	Non-material amendment sought following grant of planning permission 2326/05 for revisions to landscaping as approved under condition 1 & 5(d) and changes to the design of the storm water drainage system approved under Condition 12 of planning permission 2326/05; together with the installation of a low voltage local substation.	Granted
2679/11	Erection of 14 dwellings comprising 9 two-bedroom dwellings, 5 four-bedroom dwellings together with associated garaging and car parking. (Substitution of house types to plots 233,237, 278-281, 284-287 and 290-293 as approved under reserved matters approval 3489/09.	Granted
1502/11	Erection of 37 residential dwellings comprising 9 x three-bedroom and 8 x two-bedroom houses and 8 x two-bedroom and 12 x one-bedroom flats; together with associated parking/garaging and the construction of an on-site pumping station on land adjacent to Gipping Road (revisions to part of housing layout approved under planning permission reserved matters 3489/09 and outline planning permission 2326/05 and part additional land formerly within station site reference 0376/06 and 3064/10).	Granted
1194/11	Discharge of S106 schedules for Great Blakenham housing - recreation area, planting specification, play equipment specification.	Approved
0749/11	<b>Application for approval of reserved matters including design and external appearance of local centre, police station, pursuant to condition 1 (in part) of outline planning permission 2326/05 granted by Secretary of State on 7th May 2008, together with additional details pursuant to conditions 5 (in part), 13 and 14. (The details supplement those approved under reference 3489/09) (Supplementary landscaping details received 25/01/2011) [Resubmission details of the siting, design and external appearance of the local centre and associated landscaping].</b>	Granted
0668/11	Construction Management Plan pursuant to	Not approved

S106 for 2326/05

0151/11	<b>Application for approval of reserved matters including design and external appearance of local centre, police station, and employment buildings (Class B1(a) office use) and details of 350 dwellings, pursuant to condition 1 of outline planning permission 2326/05 granted by Secretary of State on 7th May 2008, together with additional details pursuant to conditions 5, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 20. (The details supplement those approved under reference 3489/09) (Supplementary landscaping details received 25/01/2011).</b>	<b>Split decision</b>
3489/09	Application for approval of reserved matters details of 350 dwellings, pursuant (in part) to condition 1 of outline planning permission 2326/05 granted by the Secretary of State on 7th May 2008, together with: -details of levels (in part condition 5a); -sustainable features (in part condition 5b); -recycling measures (in part condition 5c). -landscaping principles (in part condition 5d), - road footpath, bus, cycle, pedestrian, parking and access arrangements (in part condition 5e); -materials (condition 5f); - acoustic measures (condition 5g); -written scheme of archaeological investigation (condition); -contamination strategy (condition 11a & b); firefighting arrangements (in part condition 15); survey, trapping, translocation of grass snakes (condition 22).	Split decision
2326/05	<b>Residential development with associated community and retail facilities including public open space, local centre, primary school and on and off site highways, drainage and related infrastructure.</b>	<b>Granted by SoS November 2008</b>
1969/10	<b><u>SnOasis</u></b> Application for extension of time for the implementation of the "SnOasis" a ski centre, holiday resort, centre for winter sports excellence, leisure and associated uses and related on and off site infrastructure (originally permitted under outline planning permission OL/100/04)	Granted 31 October 2011
0100/04/OL	For planning permission to develop (SnOasis) a ski centre and holiday resort, centre for winter sports excellence, leisure and associated uses	Granted by SoS November 2008

and related on and off site infrastructure

3064/10	<b><u>Railway Station</u></b> Application to replace extant planning permission, in order to extend the time limit for implementation use of land for the development of a railway station with associated passenger facilities, footbridge, decked and surface car parking, access road and related infrastructure as previously granted under OL/0376/06	Granted 3 October 2012
0376/06	Use of land for the development of a railway station with associated passenger facilities, footbridge, decked and surface car parking, access road and related infrastructure	Granted 6 November 2008

## PROPOSAL

Outline planning permission was granted under ref: 2326/05 for residential development, local centre, public open space, primary school, commercial units and highway works.

Reserved matters for the residential element and the local centre and commercial units were subsequently granted under refs: 3489/09, 0151/11 and 0749/11. Since then there have been a number of smaller applications to alter elements of the layout/house types.

The original outline planning permission has been implemented and the applicant intends to build out 156 dwellings under the original permission.

### **(a) To date the applicant has provided the following S106 contributions:**

- Works to Chapel Lane have been substantially completed but are not finished
- £10,000 Chapel Lane contribution for traffic regulation orders sum has been paid and spent
- Link Road between Chapel Lane and Gipping Road is substantially completed but not finished
- 81 Affordable houses are built and occupied
- 0.5ha of land has been set aside for open space but has not been landscaped for use
- Sports field has been offered for transfer but has not been transferred due to legal issues
- £80,000 health care commuted sum paid for Needham Market Country Practice. In the process of being transferred to NHS.
- £130,379 police commuted sum paid and partly spent
- £25,000 commuted sum towards Sproughton traffic mitigation paid and spent
- £6,000 roadside nature reserve commuted sum paid and spent
- Some structural landscaping provided

### **(b) The following S106 requirements have been triggered but not provided to date:**

- Implementation of travel plan
- Some highway works are not completed
- Car park and fencing of sports field

- Transfer of sports ground
- Sports commuted sum approximately £550,000
- Index linking to health payments
- Grade and transfer some of the open space
- Open space commuted sum £300,000
- Education commuted sum approximately £1,000,000 (based on 249 dwellings within phase 1 area shown on plan in S106)
- Up to £17,208 OSSI commuted sum

**(c) The following additional s106 requirements will be triggered if 156 dwellings are built out and occupied under the current planning permission:**

- Police commuted sum approximately £80,000
- Provide police station
- Provide local centre
- Provide village green

The current planning application is proposing that instead of completing the extant scheme beyond 156 dwellings, the remainder of the site be developed in accordance with this revised planning application.

The application seeks planning permission to develop the site for:

270 dwelling houses, comprising 110 two-bed houses, 135 three-bed houses and 25 four-bed houses, a retail unit with 6 flats above, open space and play areas, highway infrastructure and parking and landscaping.

**(d) The applicant is proposing to provide the following infrastructure to be secured by S106 in addition to that already provided to date under (a) above:**

- £150,000 of children's play equipment
- 0.76ha of public open space on site laid out for use (includes the 0.5ha set aside but not laid out referred to above)
- long term maintenance and management of open space
- 0.12ha Hackneys Corner Piece laid out and made available for use
- £50,000 for Great Blakenham Community Hall and/or Parish Rooms
- £1,382,558 for school age education and Early Years
- Completion of highway works required to support a residential scheme only
- Transfer sports field to MSDC
- £537,000 towards sport provision (to include £100,000 linked to land transfer)
- Health £63,000 towards health provision

POLICY

Planning Policy Guidance

See Appendix below.

CONSULTATIONS

Great Blakenham Parish Council :

- Support. Proposed parking is inadequate. Existing parking issues with residents parking on the roads. There are drainage problems on the site that need addressing. Would like traffic lights at junction of Gipping and Bramford Roads at Hackneys Corner to allow pedestrians safe use of the proposed crossing.

Barham Parish Council:

- None received.

Claydon and Whitton Parish Council:

- Object. Large development in already overdeveloped area. Insufficient infrastructure and not enough amenities, GP surgery, schools, nursery schools etc.

Sproughton Parish Council :

- Wrong for contributions to be dependent on houses prices. Authorities should set infrastructure contributions required. Current house price values exceed those of 2006. Covenant to provide Sproughton Mitigation Measures is not dependant on delivery of the scheme and the obligation to pay the money remains. Additional traffic predicted to use Sproughton in the Transport Assessment shows no causal link to economic circumstances.
- The sum of money due for Sproughton Mitigation under the extant permission is only for mitigation of additional traffic generated from the housing development. SnOasis is extant and the trips from that development overlap with the trips from the housing development. Sproughton Mitigation Measures are still required. Sustainability of roads and junctions in Sproughton has not been assessed.
- The amount of the Sproughton Mitigation measures was set by the County Council in relation to the money needed for effective mitigation. Sproughton Mitigation measures requirement is fully compliant with the tests that planning obligations must meet. Development is only acceptable if mitigation of the predicted impacts is possible and effective. Agree with County Council requirement that Sproughton Mitigation Measures be incorporated in s106.
- Additional traffic generated by the development will route through Sproughton village. No assessment of the likely significant effects within Sproughton village. Current proposal is similar to that previously approved therefore likely to have similar impacts and require similar mitigation. No need to revise the Sproughton Mitigation Measures in order to separate the housing and SnOasis proposals.
- Safe and free flow of traffic and pedestrian safety in Sproughton village needs assessing. The B1113 in Sproughton village is saturated with traffic at peak periods, there is no spare capacity. Not factoring the potential trips related to SnOasis would not be acceptable. Cumulative impact of traffic needs to be taken into account. Traffic congestion at the Wild Man junction. Transport assessment contains no information on



impacts within Sproughton village. Any large scale development within Great Blakenham will have knock on effects in traffic levels in Sproughton. Housing proposals will generate more traffic through Sproughton than SnOasis.

- Lower level of predicted traffic for the proposed development than the extant permission may be an error. Maybe a false assumption that HGV movements are predicted through Sproughton. Need to check if under-statements have been made.
- Where congestion exists each additional vehicle movement will increase queue length and journey time and cause road network service requirements to be exceeded.
- Findings in the TA do not accord with County Councils B1113 Sproughton Traffic Monitoring Survey of October 2007.
- A 7.5 tonne weight restriction is in force along the lengths of road through Sproughton village.

#### Suffolk County Council - Corporate s106 and Strategic Policy :

- Assessment of infrastructure requirements have been made against whole scheme for area covered by extant planning permission ref 3489/09 and associated S106.
- Anticipate minimum pupil yields from a 426 house development of 29 pre-school pupils; 99 primary pupils; 63 secondary school pupils; and 14 sixth form age pupils.
- For early years request a contribution of 29 places x 36,091 per place = £176, 639.
- Are prepared to remove requirement for transfer of a school site to the County Council only on the basis that the County Council receives developer funding of £1,205,919 (99 places x £12,181 per place) to provide off-site additional classroom places and facilities at catchment schools.
- Minimum sustainable transport requirements are: a second access onto Bramford Road; upgrade footway to shared use along Bramford Road; complete bus link to Chapel Lane with traffic lights, tank trap and parking restrictions; junction improvements at Hackneys Corner with traffic lights and upgrade footway to shared use on Bramford Road and Gipping Road; street lighting in Bramford Road and Gipping Road; village centre; and travel plan.
- Ongoing discussions between SCC and the applicant regarding drainage.
- Recommend automatic sprinkler systems and fibre optic broadband.
- There may be environmental/ecological issues to consider.

#### Suffolk County Council - Flood and Water Manager:

- In terms of the whole site the drainage system to be in accordance with CIRA697 sustainable drainage and including exceedance routes.
- Ongoing issue regarding commuted sum for drainage relates to main highway drainage and is approved in principle and is awaiting acceptance of the commuted sums by Orbit.
- Open space contains proposed highway assets with access to maintain by easement. SCC will not be adopting any part of the open space.
- SUDS for the highway element should be covered by highways comments.
- SCC will only be adopting the highway drainage elements on the site and maintenance will be covered by normal highway duties. Other elements will be with Orbit or the individual house owner.

#### Suffolk County Council Highways:

- A framework travel plan usually covers a site that is not occupied. The site is partly occupied therefore a Full Residential Travel Plan should be provided. There should be a commitment in the Travel Plan that existing residents will be

provided with welcome pack and travel planning details.

- Unlikely that residents would walk to shops and schools in Claydon. It is unclear how the environment is good for cyclists. Bus service is more limited than stated in Transport Assessment. TA does not provide information about capacity of bus service to accommodate additional passengers from the proposed development. Majority of trips likely to be by car. TA does not demonstrate that there are good opportunities to travel by non-car modes.

Following receipt of revised plans and further traffic data:

- Changing the roundabout to a priority junction at Bramford Road is acceptable. Modelling shows it will operate within capacity to 2024 and turning movements for large vehicles are accommodated
- Re-alignment of Hackneys Corner junction will make it more acceptable. Will operate within capacity to 2014 and turning movements for large vehicles can be accommodated.
- Detailed design of bus junction on Chapel Lane has been agreed but the works have not started. Traffic Regulation Orders will be required.
- Access to local centre is acceptable. A 7.5t vehicle can turn within site and exit in forward gear. Vehicle waiting for the gates to open will block two parking spaces. Will adopt bell mouth but not roads within local centre
- TA uses traffic data that is more than 3 years old. Local data taken from SCC count sites M057 and A2476 on B1113 north of Great Blakenham indicate negligible change in traffic flows 2005-2012. Accepting unlikelihood of SnOasis being constructed, are content with 2010 traffic data. Revised technical notes TN04 and TN05 show the development would not have a significant impact.
- Level of traffic would be unlikely to have a severe impact on traffic conditions in Sproughton
- Not a significant impact at junctions
- Highways agency has confirmed will not impact on A14
- Shred surface roads are acceptable and can be adopted
- Parking for dwellings conforms to Suffolk Guidance for Parking
- Level of visitor parking will result in some on street parking but not sufficient to recommend refusal
- 1 outstanding SUDS drainage issue relating to risk that water could overflow to Gipping Road and the level crossing. Applicant is looking into. If the drainage commuted sum is paid in full will adopt roads subject to S38 agreement and easement to access drainage under open space.
- List of highway matters to be included in s106
- Recommend conditions regarding details of roads to be approved, construction of roads prior to occupation, and provision of loading unloading manoeuvring and parking space.

Suffolk County Council – Landscape:

- Does not deliver a good level of soft landscape.
- There are plant failures and gaps on the ground within the existing landscaping. It is essential to ensure that deficiencies in landscape and management in the built scheme are not replicated within the remaining project.
- There are some anomalies between the coloured layout plan and the detailed layout plan.
- Scheme will be dominated by hard built form.

- Trees should be included where it is feasible. A strategy for trees in rear gardens would be beneficial.
- Not clear where hedges and trees are to be retained on the main road frontages.
- Suggest hedge species for village green. Viburnum tinus becoming over used on this site. There should be more variety of species.
- Frontage treatment to village centre is unclear. Coloured layout plan shows more trees than the detailed layout plan.
- Frontage area to village centre car park needs a stronger scheme.
- Concern about Gipping Road frontage particularly plots 100, 112 and 113. Treatment will look ineffective.
- Open space planting will need simplification to achieve good effect and ease of maintenance. Swing unit is too close to Plot 112. Play space will need to be fenced and hedged off from road. SUDS must not preclude suitable tree planting or refurbishment of play equipment.
- Plot landscape needs to be simplified to ensure it is effective.
- Planting of open space next to Bramford Road is not satisfactory. Space around electricity substation is poorly planted.
- Plots 143, 144, 158, 189, 200-202 close to roadside hedge. Not clear if hedge can be retained.
- Clarity required regarding planting around Plots 189 and 203.
- Clarity over Bramford Road frontage required.
- Disappointing that there is no longer a tree lined avenue into the development from Bramford Road.
- Plots 382, 383 and 403 close to boundary, predominance of fencing will produce suburban appearance.
- Parking areas to front of plots 323 and 324 leave insufficient space for tree planting shown on plan.
- Clarity required regarding planting next to rail line.
- Open space area to front of plots 263-273 planting is intricate and complex unlikely to be good long term structure, should be simplified, there are insufficient trees to enhance the elevations of the buildings framing the space. Largest open space concern about loss of trees.
- Lack of information in submitted proposed maintenance schedule.
- Prominent housing development there should be a greater emphasis on producing an attractive and well landscaped scheme.

#### Suffolk County Council – Minerals:

- Land within Minerals Consultation Area. Not apparent from the application how Policy WDM17 of the Suffolk County Council Waste Core Strategy March 2011 has been addressed.

#### Suffolk County Council - Rights of Way:

- No comments or observations regarding the Public Footpath 13 on the opposite side of the road.

#### MSDC – Arboriculture:

- The trees and hedges scheduled for removal are of low/limited amenity value. No objection to this element of the application.
- Will be essential to ensure high quality planting proposals for the site landscape

structure and surroundings.

- Proposed protection measures for retained trees/hedges, are in accordance with relevant industry standards and should be made subject to an appropriate planning condition.
- Following receiving revised arboriculture assessment: contradictory details have been corrected.

MSDC – Arts :

- None received.

**MSDC - Asset Utilisation/Viability:**

**Support letter from Peter Brett Associates regarding cost and value assumption (excluding land value) for final units of phase 1 and phase 2 stating:**

- **Costs appear reasonable when benchmarked against comparable schemes, SPONs data and BICS. Only opportunity to reduce costs and hence improve viability would be to alter the specification. This could impact quality and reduce sales values and or sale period which would negatively impact viability.**
- **Typically for a scheme of this nature in this location we would expect a developer return between 17.5% to 20% on GDV of the completed scheme. Most developers are unable to obtain finance at a lower rate of return. Orbit is prepared to accept a lower return of 6.5%. This is effectively a contractor or development manager return to oversee the development and does not adequately reflect the development risk. A new developer would seek a higher return which places the development at risk if Orbit were not to proceed on the basis of their proposal.**
- **Orbit has reduced their contingency allowance. Typically would expect a contingency allowance of 3% of costs as a minimum for a scheme of this type. Orbit is prepared to proceed with a 1% contingency. The contingency risk is decreased by the more detailed costing exercise undertaken. There is no additional value to be created to fund further developer contributions by seeking to reduce the contingency sum.**
- **The developer contribution package represents an appropriate planning package.**
- **It is unlikely another developer would proceed with the scheme at the reduced level of profit and contingency.**

**Provided further comments from Peter Brett Associates regarding cost and value assumption (excluding land value) for final units of phase 1 and phase 2 stating:**

- **The land value used in appraisal is the actual paid value and has not been written down. Orbits reduced profit over compensates for the write down in land value that would be required to arrive at a land value that represents existing use value plus 20%-30%. The existing use value is employment land values. It is recommended to add 20%-30% to existing use value to achieve a threshold land value for a development site.**

**Commented that:**

- **The industry standard for developers profit is between 15-20%**
- **Phase 1 profit on gross development value for market housing is 13.15%**
- **Phase 1 has a deficit which is carried forward into Phase 2**
- **No profit was made on the affordable housing**
- **Phase 2 profit margin on gross development value is 6.9%**
- **Phase 2 achieves a 10% margin with a forecast market growth on completion in**

**2020**

- **Blended profit for Phase 1 and Phase 2 with growth is 11.4%**
- **Profit is below developers expectations on schemes such as this**

MSDC - Asset Management – Drainage: none received.

MSDC - Environmental Health - Land Contamination:

- Request land contamination condition to ensure that the land remediation is completed across the whole site.

MSDC - Environmental Health – Emissions:

- Recommend updated noise assessment prior to commencement of development.
- Recommend condition regarding any external mechanical ventilation or air conditioning on convenience store.
- Recommend condition restricting opening hours of the convenience store to 0700 until 2200 Monday to Saturday, 0800 until 1600 on Sundays and bank holidays, no deliveries before 0730 or after 1900 Monday to Saturday or before 0800 or after 1600 on Sundays and Bank holidays.
- Recommend condition restricting construction hours and to submit a construction management plan. All in the interests of residential amenity.

MSDC – Environmental Health – Sustainability Issues – policies state that development should have 10% of energy from renewable sources and achieve Code for Sustainable Homes 4. Previous applications did not include such information. Therefore, it would be inconsistent to request it now.

MSDC - Planning Enforcement:

- No current enforcement investigations.

MSDC - Planning Policy :

- Overall site is included in the housing trajectory as part of the 5 year housing supply with planning permission for 356 houses of which 106 completed as at 31 March 2014 Annual Monitoring Report.
- Proposed increase in numbers welcomed as a contribution to the 5 year supply.
- Convenience store would be a useful addition to Great Blakenham to serve the housing and employment areas as most existing services some distance away at Claydon.
- Strategic Housing has commented on affordable housing.

MSDC - Strategic Housing:

- The existing planning permission for the site includes the 81 affordable houses built on site and a further 32 affordable houses that was to be included in the next phase.
- The 81 units on site benefited from KickStart grant funding from the Homes and Communities Agency.
- The current application proposes no further affordable housing.
- Would normally require 149 affordable dwellings for a development of 426 dwellings.
- The extant permission included 32% affordable housing.
- The application will result in 19% affordable housing across wider site.
- The application increases the number of dwellings to be built across the overall site and takes out the remaining affordable housing to be built under the extant planning

permission. The reduction in affordable housing is disappointing in view of the grant previously invested in the site. With the increase in housing prices in the last 2 years there is an increasing need for affordable housing. There are 1000 households on the councils housing register.

- In terms of the market housing proposed most are 2 and 3 bedroom with a smaller number of 4 bed. 2 and 3 bed homes are the most in need for young families. Scheme does not include suitable housing for older people. New homes do not conform to Lifetime homes standard or wheelchair use. No bungalows.
- Viability case has been examined and the housing and infrastructure package has been assessed as the maximum amount the development can produce. Suggest uplift clause in S106 to secure funding for affordable housing if there is additional profit above that included in the viability assessment. Is important that development is built out and does not stall. If the development stalled the residents would be left living on a building site and the infrastructure would not be delivered.

#### MSDC - Strong Communities (OSS1 and Public Open Space):

- Policy position is to request £1,864,360 towards social infrastructure in accordance with the SPD for Social Infrastructure including Open Space, Sport and Recreation. This would include Play areas, outdoor pitches, informal recreational space, village halls and community centre, swimming pools, sports halls, Outdoor and other sports pitches and synthetic turf pitch.
- However, the application has been subject to S106 negotiation due to viability issue. The application accords with the negotiations to provide £50,000 towards community facilities and £600,000 towards sports facilities in the locality and transfer of existing sports pitches to the Council.
- Due to the proposed timing of the contributions coming later in the build out request flexibility so can work to achieve maximum benefit for the community by helping to secure additional match funding to help improve and enhance local facilities.
- Endorse comments made by SCC landscape regarding on site open spaces.
- In general the play areas take on board pre-application comments with the exception of matters raised by SCC Landscape. Financial value of play equipment should be demonstrated.
- Timing of provision should not be left until the end of the development.
- Suggest conditions regarding play equipment, and management and maintenance.
- Regarding the wider health benefits from open space refer to The Kings Fund internet resource Access to green and open spaces and the role of leisure services.

#### Anglian Water:

- Development proposes to connect to a private pumping station therefore does not require a response.

#### Avenues East:

- None received.

#### Environment Agency:

- Does not give rise to any material change to the impacts of the development proposal on the environment. No objection.

#### Essex and Suffolk Water:

- None received.

**Fire and Rescue:**

- Request condition to require fire hydrants. Recommend sprinkler system and consult water authority.

**Health and Safety Executive :**

- Do not advise against granting planning permission.

**Highways Agency:**

- Direction that planning permission not be granted until 30 January 2015 due to requiring time to consider proposal.
- Direction that planning permission not be granted until 31 January 2015 due to insufficient information to determine whether the traffic generated would be incompatible with use of the A14 as part of national system of routes for through traffic.
- Following receipt of additional information: no objection.

**Homes and Communities Agency:**

- The housing units, which were funded under the KickStart programme have been delivered. No comment.

**Ministry of Defence :**

- No safeguarding objection.

**National Health Service :**

- Raise a holding objection.
- Likely to have a significant impact on NHS funding programme.
- A contribution would be required to mitigate the capital cost to the NHS for the provision of additional health care services arising as a result of the development. This takes into account the existing planning permission and the contributions already made under that permission.
- Application does not include a Healthcare Impact Assessment or propose any health care mitigation.
- Provided a plan of the GP catchment area relevant to the site.
- 276 dwellings likely to generate a population of 642.2. Spare capacity at GP Practice at Barham and Claydon is negative (-386). The overall proposal to build a total of 432 dwellings generates a population of 994, requiring 0.55 additional GP requiring 71.5 square metres floor space at a capital cost of £143,000. This does not include costs of additional car parking. The developer has paid £80,000 towards health care. Therefore require £63,000 as part of this application to mitigate health costs.
- Applicant has not proven the development is sustainable due to lack of health care provision.
- Proposal conflicts with policies CS6, FC1 and FC1.1. Conflicts with paragraphs 17, 69, 70, 156, 162 and 196 of NPPF.
- NHS will lift objection if £63,000 is provided to mitigate healthcare impacts.

**Natural England:**

- No objection in respect of nature conservation sites. In close proximity to Little Blakenham Pit, Great Blakenham Pit, Sandy Lane Pit and Barham Sites of Special Scientific Interest. Satisfied that the development will not damage or destroy the interest features of these sites. SSSI do not represent a constraint on determining the

application. Have not assessed impact on protected species. Refer to standing advice. Recommend biodiversity and landscape enhancements.

**Network Rail :**

- No objection. Issues regarding the proposed/implemented footway/cycle way improvements on Gipping Road. The footway/cycleway runs up to the level crossing on the west side then stops. There are no improvements on the eastern side of the crossing.

**Ramblers Association:**

- None received.

**Sport England:**

- Does not wish to raise an objection. Do not wish to recommend conditions. Support use of proposed £600,000 contribution towards quantitative and qualitative improvements to sports sites in the locality that would serve the residents of the development.

**Suffolk Police Force:**

- Request £209,976 towards recruitment and equipping of staff, one PCSO for 3 years, police vehicle, automatic number plate recognition (APNR), and premises. In order to mitigate lack of capacity in existing infrastructure to accommodate population growth and associated demands.
- Based on 2.4 residents per dwelling predict a population growth of 648. Therefore forecast an additional 18 crimes and 91 incidents per annum. £19,316 is the additional cost per annum of forecasted increase in crime. Increased staffing level of 0.67 to police area will be required. Police funding based on a 3 year projection. Therefore, it will be three years before the increase in population is included in the police funding. Therefore, require funding from development for 3 years to cover this gap. Set up costs for new staff required is £12,744. Cost of 1 PCSO for 3 years is £80,409. Costs of additional vehicles to maintain staff to vehicle ratio is £20,750. Will require 1 additional APNR camera at a cost of £60,073. Require additional space to accommodate additional PCSO at a cost of £36,000.
- Funding for the resource secured through the extant permission expires June 2015.
- Funding from the extant permission is for an Officer. Funding sought from the current application is a PCSO.
- The PCSO would be stationed at the nearest Safer Neighbourhood Team (SNT) at Needham.
- The vehicle would be dedicated to the SNT where the funded PCSO would be stationed.
- Cameras are part of a national infrastructure of cameras that assist law enforcement agencies to help with prevention, detection and disruption of crime and protecting vulnerable persons.
- A population growth based on the overall site necessitates the funding of PCSO in addition to the funding obtained under the extant permission.
- Requesting a PCSO rather than a Police Officer reduces costs by around £50,000.
- Justification for an ANPR and vehicle are increased as a result of the premises on site no longer being sought.
- Current staffing for MSDC based on a population of 97,973 is 101 staff
- Increased staffing level based on grown of population of 1,037 is 1.07 staff



Suffolk Wildlife Trust:

- None received.

## LOCAL AND THIRD PARTY REPRESENTATIONS

This is a summary of the representations received. At the time of writing the report letters from 15 properties have been received making the following comments:

11 objecting on the following grounds:

- Number of houses.
- Great Blakenham has seen massive development but have not seen any associated infrastructure. Lack of infrastructure / Inadequate amenities / facilities including school, doctors and community clubs, shop, play group, evening bus service, education, pre-school, for families, one pub, facilities for young people. Stuck in over populated village with no facilities.
- Infrastructure that needs sorting includes more primary places within walking distance, extra GP services, village centre not just another co-op, upgrades to roads, pelican crossing near the parish rooms, police
- Local schools, shops, doctors, transport under strain, oversubscribed afternoon clubs and play group, early years is full, doctors at Claydon and Needham Market can take no more patients, difficult to get appointment and park at doctors and the development will make the situation worse and does little to resolve issues.
- These problems should be sorted out before more housing planned. Facilities / infrastructure should be provided before more housing
- Obligations not provided. In the past developers have not paid the monies they have agreed to. No S106 payments from previous development. Risk of further payments not happening. Promised infrastructure has not been upheld. The nursery and shops have not been provided. Improvements to Doctors surgery not provided. Platitudes in planning summary disingenuous and affront to those that live in area and suffer consequences.
- Developer not keeping to previously agreed housing numbers for site. More than agreed following SnOasis enquiry.
- Designed to maximise profits from land. Not viable.
- Employment provided by greenhouse project is irrelevant.
- Need assurance that if SnOasis is developed more housing will not be required.
- Roads are not safe for children to walk or cycle to school on their own.
- Moved to village to have that 'village feel'. Loss of village identity. Being turned into an extension of Ipswich.
- Concern about future marketability of house. Concern that was not fully aware of proposals 4 months ago when bought house.
- Objections are of far more concern than the risk of having a patch of bare land.
- Large growth where there is little identified local need is of concern. Need to leave opportunities for future growth.
- Small village being swamped with housing. Area cannot cope with anymore increase in population. Too much development in this area in recent years. There are other more suitable sites. Residents of Great Blakenham at breaking point. Cumulative impact with incinerator. Concerns about cumulative impact with other development outside Great Blakenham. Area has had enough. Another area of Suffolk should take a share of the

Social burden. Welfare of new residents not considered. Enough is enough. Residents feel let down. Not good for the residents of the village.

- Noise and pollution from more traffic and houses.
- Increase in residents and bored children could lead to increase in crime rates. Limited police presence. Funds requested by Suffolk Constabulary should be paid up front. Likely of increase in incidents reported to the police. Security, police presence has been reduced to a minimum. Extra policing will be required but this is not being provided.
- Lack of public transport. Bus services have been cut. Closure of Bury Road Park and Ride. Bus is full by the time it gets to Great Blakenham. Last bus from Ipswich is 6.30 so there is no evening service to visit Ipswich. Loss of reliable bus service. More people without transport having to rely on part time bus service makes no sense. Need own transport to get anywhere.
- Journeys will be a dangerous nightmare due to traffic on the road serving the incinerator. Additional lorries through Great Blakenham from Lion Barn development and cars from Needham chalk pit. Cumulative impact with nearby development at Needham Market and non-residential development on the local highway network. Roads already congested. Increasing traffic. Noise and pollution from more traffic. Cumulative impact of development and traffic impacts on junctions 52/53 of A14 and resulting in more rat running. Church Lane Claydon regularly grid locked and banks overrun, is a consequence of development and should be resolved with funds from developments. Road improvements for Blakenham Fields and Incinerator have not been dealt with. More traffic without road improvements. Existing problems need to be resolved before more housing is delivered.
- B1113 dangerous road to cross. No crossing. Not enough safe pedestrian crossings along B1113. Still quibbling about whether village will get a pedestrian crossing.
- Almost permanently closed railway crossing. Difficulty using crossing as pedestrian due to existing traffic using Sackers and amount of time barriers are down. Increasing traffic and long tail back could result in a car getting struck on the tracks. Not enough time to leave the barrier open between passing trains. Increase on street parking problem near level crossing.

#### 4 raising specific concerns:

- Newts are present on the site. My cat brings them home alive and I release them onto the site.
- Object if there is to be an alley to the rear of plot 382 as it could lead to fly tipping, fouling, loitering as well as exposing 54 Chapel lane to access.
- Concern about fencing to be erected at rear of 54 Chapel Ln.
- Concern about plots 393 to 402. They look straight into back window of 62 Chapel Ln. loss of privacy.
- Expected LPA to notify those who had previously commented on this site. Questioned whether LPA will be notifying those that had previously made comments. Asked when consultation period expires.

#### 1 supporting:

- Happy to see development progressing.
- Hope facilities develop as per the plans.
- Concern about Gipping Bramford Road link being used as a cut through when the

crossing is down. Suggest traffic calming because speed of traffic on the estate can already be too high. The cut through route will go past two public open spaces and there are large number of families and children on the estate.

- No objection. Insufficient parking spaces. One and half spaces per house are not much. There are lots of cars lining road. It can be difficult to pass the parked cars as a pedestrian or in a car. Masons Drive will be used as a rat run by people stuck at the level crossing to get to B1113, this will pass a green area where children play.

## ASSESSMENT

8. The main issues in this case are: planning history; the principle of the development in this location; viability; transport; character and appearance of the area; residential amenity; community facilities; infrastructure; biodiversity; and phasing.

### PLANNING HISTORY

The site forms part of a larger site that benefits from planning permission for redevelopment. The extant planning permission for the larger site includes:

- housing,
- a local centre,
- a school,
- commercial units,
- on site open space,
- and highway works.

Approximately 156 houses have been constructed/under construction and 126 of these occupied to date. Work has not commenced on the local centre, commercial units or the school proposal.

The current S106 attached to the extant planning permission includes the following:

- construct a roundabout at Bramford Road
- Reconfigure Bramford Road / Gipping Road junction
- Works along Bramford Road and Gipping Road
- Works to Chapel Lane
- £10,000 for Chapel Lane Works traffic orders
- Link Road from Chapel Lane to Gipping Road
- 113 affordable houses = 32% of the development
- Provide land for a school
- Approximately £1 million towards education
- Approximately 1.1ha of open space on site and transfer to Council
- Approximately £300,000 towards open space
- Transfer sports field to Council
- Approximately £550,000 towards reconfiguration of sports field
- Up to £17,208 OSSI commuted sum
- Provide local centre
- Provide village green and transfer to Council
- Approximately £101,000 towards health
- Provide police station

- Approximately £300,000 towards police
- £75,000 towards traffic mitigation measures in Sproughton
- £6,000 for a roadside nature reserve
- Structural landscaping
- Construction management measures

At the same time as the outline planning permission for the residential site was granted, outline planning permission was also under consideration following Inquiry for SnOasis and a railway station. In the interests of context the "extended" time outline planning permission for SnOasis expires 31 October 2016, and for the railway station expires 3 October 2017.

This planning application for residential development must be determined on the basis that the planning permissions for SnOasis and the railway station are extant and a developer is entitled to pursue them should they so wish. Before development can commence on either SnOasis or the railway Station, reserved matters applications and a number of details required by conditions need to be submitted and assessed. To date no such information has been submitted and determined.

The current proposal includes part of the area of land that benefits from planning permission ref 2326/05 for housing, the land previously proposed for commercial units and for a school. The current application does not impinge on the land that benefits from planning permission for a rail station.

The extant permission for SnOasis includes a roundabout at the junction of the internal estate road on the application site with Bramford Road. This application proposes a staggered junction in this location. The layout proposed allows sufficient space for a roundabout to be constructed at a later date if necessary and the land can be reserved for that purposes.

The extant planning permission for SnOasis and the residential site provide for the existing sports ground to be transferred to the council and for it to be reconfigured to allow for the construction of a roundabout at the junction of the sites with Bramford Road. The current application is proposing a staggered junction in this location that does not impinge on the current extent of the sports ground. Therefore, the sports ground will only need to be reconfigured if the SnOasis planning permission were to be implemented as it stands. There is no longer a need to reconfigure the sports ground to facilitate the housing development from a physical space point of view. However, there are legal issues regarding land ownership that could affect the need to reconfigure the sports field. These issues are set out under the section below on Community Facilities.

The planning permission ref 2326/05 for the local centre includes a police station. This was intended to service the SnOasis development. The current application does not include a police station. Therefore, if the current application were to be approved and carried out in full it would result in no physical provision being made for police space in Great Blakenham. The SnOasis proposal does not include provision for police station. This matter is a material consideration in the determination of the current application. Police infrastructure is set out under the section below on Infrastructure.

### **PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT**

The site is located outside the Settlement Boundary for Great Blakenham in the Saved Local Plan. Therefore, there is a policy presumption against development in such locations. Great Blakenham is identified as a Key Service Centre in the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy Focused Review identifies Key Service Centres as locations that can accommodate additional housing growth.

Paragraph 47 of the NPPF requires LPAs to identify a 5 year supply of specific deliverable housing sites. NPPF Paragraph 49 states that '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 housing land supply for Mid Suffolk at January 2015 is 4.3 years. This undersupply amounts to approximately 300 houses. The site has already been counted as contributing 356 dwellings to the 5 year supply of housing due to the extant permission and this proposal would contribute an additional 76 dwellings to the housing land supply. The additional houses complies with the NPPF policy to increase housing supply.

For a site to contribute to the 5 year supply of housing required by the NPPF the proposed development must be deliverable. To be deliverable a site should be available now, be a suitable location for development, have a realistic prospect of housing being delivered within 5 years and be viable. The site is currently available for development. The location benefits from an extant permission for development. The proposed timetable for development of the site is set out in the Phasing section below. The developers are currently on site. Full details of the viability considerations are set out below in the Viability section.

The extant permission includes 113 affordable houses. 81 of these have been built and are occupied. The Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) have commented that the housing units funded under the KickStart programme have been delivered. The current application proposes no further affordable housing. Therefore, the total number of affordable dwellings across the wider site would be 81 making a total of 19% affordable dwellings.

Strategic Housing has commented that they would seek 149 affordable homes for a development of 432 dwellings. However, they are prepared to accept the lower level of affordable housing proposed on viability grounds and to safeguard continued delivery. Strategic Housing is keen for the site to be built out so that the existing residents are not left on a building site and so that appropriate infrastructure is provided. Strategic Housing has requested an uplift clause to secure affordable housing if there is additional profit above that shown in the submitted viability. This matter of an uplift clause is considered under the viability section below. The application needs to be determined on the basis that it is not proposing any affordable housing.

Core Strategy Policy CS7 seeks 50% of dwellings to be built on brownfield/previously developed land. The site is previously developed land and therefore complies with Policy CS7. The application site benefits from extant planning permission under outline ref: 2326/05 and reserved matter refs: 3489/09, 0151/11 and 0749/11 for housing, a school, commercial units, retail units, a police station, community uses falling within the D Classes and some public open space. The proposed retail units with 6 flats above would be located in the same area as currently benefits from planning permission for a local centre including retail, police station and community uses. The proposed housing would be located on land that currently benefits from planning permission for housing, a school and commercial units.

The proposal if implemented would result in a loss of land proposed for employment use.

Since the original grant of planning permission for this site there have been a number of changes in policy and employment uses have been permitted in the locality. The current application is being assessed against current policy and circumstances. As set out above it is appropriate to secure the delivery of additional housing land. There are existing employment uses in the vicinity of the site that offer alternative employment opportunities. There are no identified end users for the extant employment permission.

The proposal if implemented would result in a loss of land proposed for a school. Suffolk County Council as education authority has commented that this is acceptable subject to them receiving money to expand nearby schools. The organisation of school provision is a County matter. Therefore, there does not appear to be reason to determine this application other than in accordance with current Education Authority requirements.

For these reasons, on balance, the principle of the proposal in this location accords with the policy aims to provide additional housing, to build on brownfield land, and to locate new development in proximity to existing services.

#### **VIABILITY**

National Government Planning Practice Guidance states that where the deliverability of the development may be compromised by the scale of planning obligations and other costs, a viability assessment may be necessary. This should be informed by the particular circumstances of the site and proposed development in question. A site is viable if the value generated by its development exceeds the costs of developing it and also provides sufficient incentive for the land to come forward and the development to be undertaken. To incentivise the bringing back into use of brownfield sites, local planning authorities should take a flexible approach in seeking levels of planning obligations and other contributions to ensure that the combined total impact does not make a site unviable. Where an applicant is able to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the local planning authority that the planning obligation would cause the development to be unviable, the local planning authority should be flexible in seeking planning obligations. However, where safeguards are necessary to make a particular development acceptable in planning terms, and these safeguards cannot be secured, planning permission should not be granted for unacceptable unsustainable development.

The applicant has submitted a viability appraisal with the application. The appraisal seeks to make the case that the extant planning permission and S106 obligations are not viable and that the revised obligations offered are the most that the applicant can reasonably provide from the revised proposed development.

The applicant is proposing to complete 156 dwellings of the extant permission and is proposing 276 dwellings and a shop as part of this application. There are currently 126 occupied from the extant permission and a further 30 to be completed/built. All the 276 dwellings and the shop in this application are a proposed future development. The infrastructure has been part provided on site and much is to be completed as the remainder of the site is built out. The viability work has been presented in parts covering the different stages of development which are referred to as phase 1 and phase 2. Phase 1 is the 156 dwellings from the extant permission and phase 2 is the 276 dwellings and shop proposed by this application.

The appraisal has been assessed by MSDC Asset Utilisation Officers and Peter Brett Associates (PBA). PBA have assessed viability for final units of phase 1 and phase 2. PBA have commented that, with the exception of land values, the cost and value assumptions used

appear reasonable. PBA have not identified any opportunities for additional developer contributions to be funded from the development. PBA have commented that the land value used in the appraisal is the actual paid value and that Orbits reduced profit for final units of phase 1 and phase 2 over compensates for the write down in land value that would be required to arrive at a land value that is representative of industry standard ways of calculating a threshold land value for a site.

MSDC Asset Utilisation Officers have confirmed that the profit on gross development value from Phase 1 is 13.15% and on Phase 2 is 6.9% without forecast market growth. The overall profit with forecast market growth is 11.4%. This is below the normal return developers seek. The return sought on a development reflects the perceived risk involved in the project.

Therefore, the viability report prepared by the applicant is considered credible by MSDC Officers as a basis for re-considering the infrastructure provided by this development. Consideration of each aspect of infrastructure is set out in the relevant sections below.

PBA have commented that typically for a scheme of this nature in this location a developer return between 17.5% to 20% on GDV of the completed scheme would be expected. Most developers are unable to obtain finance at a lower rate of return. Orbit is prepared to accept a lower return of 6.5% on the final units of phase 1 and phase 2. This is effectively a "contractor or development manager" return to oversee the development and does not commercially reflect the development risk. A new developer would seek a higher return which places the development at risk if Orbit were not to proceed on the basis of their proposal. It is unlikely another developer would proceed with the scheme at the reduced level of profit and contingency.

If Orbit chose not to continue with the development of the site there is a possibility that the site would remain part built out due to the viability issues at this site. There are currently 156 houses completed/under construction of which 126 are occupied. Therefore, these properties would remain on the site, further infrastructure may not be provided or would be severely delayed and the remainder of the site would remain as open land. The potential for such situation to arise is a consideration relevant to the current application.

Mindful that certain planning obligations remain undischarged at the time of writing it is also foreseeable that litigation might become necessary to enforce those obligations. This too contains the potential for risk and uncertainty for community expectations.

Strategic housing has requested an uplift clause to secure affordable housing if there is additional profit above that shown in the submitted viability. To encourage a developer to increase profit an uplift clause would normally work on the basis that additional profit is split between the developer and the planning obligation requirement. In this case the developer profit is below the normal return of about 17% that developers seek on housing developments. Given, how far short the development is from the normal return, an uplift clause is not going to form part of the recommendation on this application and has not been included in the current draft S106 agreement.

## **TRANSPORT**

### **Railway**

The application proposal does not impinge on the use of or access to the land that benefits from planning permission for a rail station. Network Rail has been consulted on the application. After raising some initial concerns they have confirmed that they have no

objection to the application. Therefore, the proposal should not interfere with the safe operation of the railway.

#### A14

The Highways Agency has been consulted on the application. They initially raised some concerns. Following receipt of further information, the Highways Agency has confirmed that they have no objection to the application. Therefore, the proposal should not cause congestion or safety issues for the operation of the A14/trunk road network and associated junctions.

#### Local Highway Network

The application proposes a staggered junction along Bramford Road instead of a roundabout, a toucan crossing on Bramford Road, realignment of the Hackneys Corner junction to form a priority junction without traffic lights, 2 informal crossings with islands on Bramford Road, pedestrian and cycle links from Orion Business Park to Hackneys Corner, a fully signalised bus only junction on Chapel Lane, and an access to the local centre from Gipping Road.

Suffolk County Council Highways have been consulted on the application and advised that the highway proposals are acceptable. The modelling of the staggered junction on Bramford Road and Hackneys Corner will operate within capacity to the 2014 assessment year. Turning movements for large vehicles can be accommodated at all the junctions. The realignment of Hackneys Corner junction will make it more acceptable. Therefore, the highway works should not result in a hazard or inconvenience to users of the public highway.

Suffolk County Council Highways comment that they are content with the traffic assessment submitted and that traffic from the development is unlikely to have a significant impact on the highway network.

#### Layout of proposal

A 7.5t vehicle can turn within the local centre site and exit in forward gear. A vehicle waiting for the gates to open at the service delivery area of the shop will block two parking spaces.

The road hierarchy in the residential part of the site including the shared surface roads have been designed to adoptable standards. The parking provision conforms to the 2015 Suffolk Guidance for Parking subject to the garages being retain for parking. There is some space for some on street visitor parking without causing an obstruction.

The ability of cars to travel through the site from Gipping road to Bramford is unchanged from the extant permission.

#### On Site Highway drainage

The site includes drainage for the highway under the largest area of open space. Subject to the applicant paying the County Council a commuted sum for maintenance of the underground drainage and providing the county Council with an easement over the open space in order to maintain the drainage, then the County Council will be willing to adopt the roads and associated highway drainage. The applicant has made provision to provide the commuted sum and has agreed to provide the easement.

Suffolk County council have commented that there is one outstanding drainage issue that has not resolved relating to the area around the proposed rail station. There is a risk that water could overflow to Gipping Road and the level crossing.



Sproughton

Sproughton Parish Council support the provision of Sproughton Mitigation Measures and report existing traffic issues in the village that they consider will be made worse by the extra traffic from the proposals. The extant proposal for the site includes provision for £25,000 to be paid by the developer for drawing up a scheme of works and £50,000 to be paid by the developer for carrying out such works. To date £25,000 has been paid and spent on drawing up a scheme. However, as it stands today there is not an agreed and approved scheme that could be carried out. In 2012 the County Council issued a letter to Orbit requesting the £50,000 to carry out the scheme which at that time was agreed. That scheme is not to proceed and the County Council wish to redesign that scheme.

The applicant has submitted a Transport Assessment in support of their claim that the development of the housing site would be unlikely to have a severe impact on traffic conditions in Sproughton. This information has been assessed by Suffolk County Council Highways transport consultants WSP who confirm that the level of traffic generated by the residential development would be unlikely to have a severe impact on traffic conditions in Sproughton

Consequently, Sproughton Mitigation Measures are not required to mitigate the impact of this development and are therefore not included in the draft s106. However, the existing S106 will remain and therefore the clauses in that agreement which cover the provision of Sproughton Mitigation Measures will continue to apply to the development built out under the extant permission.

SCC and MSDC Officers are exploring alternative options for drawing up and providing a revised scheme. A verbal update on this matter will be provided at the Committee meeting.

Travel Plan

A travel plan has been submitted with the application. A number of concerns have been raised about the submitted travel plan. This issue can be dealt with by condition. Therefore, it is proposed that a condition is used to secure agreement and implementation of a travel plan prior to occupation of the 1st dwelling of this current application, this is equivalent to prior to occupation of the 157<sup>th</sup> dwelling of the wider site.

**CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE**Layout

In terms of area of land that already has permission for housing, the proposed layout is similar to the extant permission. The new housing in the areas previously proposed as school and commercial units follow a similar design approach to the extant housing layout. Although this part of the site would be developed at a much higher density than the extant permission. The retail unit would be located in a similar position to the extant local centre, although with a different orientation. There is a similar situation for the associated car park. This proposal introduces residential uses into the area of the local centre. The public open space is in similar locations to the extant permission with the exception of an additional area adjacent to Bramford Road. Therefore, although there are some concerns about the density of the layout, given the similarity to the extant permission these would not be sufficient reason to warrant refusal of the application.

### Design

The size of the proposed open market dwellings accords with the dwelling size need in the District. However, the proposal does not include any provision for older people and the houses are not lifetime homes or wheelchair accessible. The design and external appearance of the dwellings is in keeping with those that have been approved for the site and those that are built / under construction. Therefore, the design of the dwellings is in keeping with the overall character already approved for this site. The materials proposed for the dwellings are similar to those already used on the wider site.

The design of the retail unit with flats above differs significantly from the extant permission. The proposed building is of a domestic scale in keeping with the residential area and has been designed to address the various frontages.

### Landscaping

SCC Landscape has raised concerns about the lack of landscaping and softening of the site resulting in a hard urban form. The submitted plans show less planting on site than the extant permission. However, in some parts of the site there is scope for a similar amount of planting. In the area that formerly had permission for commercial units there is a significant reduction in planting opportunities. However, an additional area of open space is proposed adjacent to Bramford Road. The proximity of some properties to boundaries on Bramford Rd and Gipping Road frontage will result in limited landscaping opportunities in those locations. Part of the hedge shown along Bramford Road is unlikely to be possible due to the proximity of the proposed dwellings to this boundary. The trees and hedges scheduled for removal are of low/limited amenity value. Overall the level of planting opportunities spread across the site is less than the extant permission. An improved landscaping scheme could be secured by condition. In the overall circumstance, the landscaping scheme is acceptable for this site.

### RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

The layout of the site broadly follows that of the extant permission. Therefore, for a proportion of the site the residential amenity impacts are similar to the extant permission. The level of amenity offered to the potential occupiers of the proposed dwellings would be similar to that offered by the extant permission. The proposed dwelling houses would be similar distances from the rail line, the proposed station, the local centre, the substation and the surrounding road network to those shown on the extant permission. The site is in proximity to commercial uses that have the potential to affect residential amenity. However, much of the site already benefits from planning permission for residential uses. The current proposal would not significantly alter the mix of residential and commercial uses in this area. Environmental Health – Emissions have recommended various conditions to safeguard the residential amenity of the occupiers of the proposed dwellings. These include submission of an updated noise assessment, restricting hours of construction and submission of a construction management plan. These matters can all be secured by condition in order to ensure that the residential amenity of the residents is not adversely affected by the development of the site.

The arrangement of residential development around the boundary with Hackneys Corner House is similar to the extant permission with the exception of an additional parking area directly adjacent to the boundary. The parking area is of limited size and is some distance from the dwelling Hackneys Corner House. The proposed residential layout should not result in a significantly greater impact on the residential amenity of the occupiers of Hackneys Corner House than the extant scheme. The building containing the retail unit with the flats above is located sufficiently far from Hackneys Corner House not to have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of the occupiers of the existing dwelling.

The extant permission shows that the existing Chapel Lane houses would have backed onto mainly the school land and commercial uses. The current proposal will result in the Chapel Lane properties backing onto the residential development. This arrangement removes the amenity issues associated with school and commercial uses, but does result in there being buildings built from closer to the Chapel Lane properties. The Chapel Lane properties have much longer rear gardens than those shown for the proposed dwellings. There is a change in levels between the site and Chapel Lane properties. A condition can be used to ensure levels details are submitted and agreed prior to development.

Although, some concerns have been raised about the arrangement of the proposed play equipment, the play areas proposed can be designed to ensure that there is separation between the play activity and the nearby houses. The provision of play equipment can be secured by s106 agreement.

Environmental Health – Emissions have recommended conditions regarding the equipment associated with the proposed retail units in order to safeguard the amenity of the residents of the proposed flats above. Subject to these conditions the flats above the retail unit should offer an adequate level of residential amenity.

A condition can be attached to ensure that any outstanding land remediation for the undeveloped part of the site is carried out to ensure all the site is fit for use for residential purposes.

#### **BIODIVERSITY**

Natural England has been consulted. The proposal should not have an adverse impact on any nearby SSSIs.

The requirement for a roadside nature reserve has been carried out under the extant planning permission. Its protection is included in the extant s106 agreement.

Following the representation raising concerns about the potential for newts on the site. The applicant provided additional comment from their ecologist stating that surveys carried out in 2004, 2009 and 2013 have not identified any Great Crested newts on the site. Great Crested Newts are present in ponds to the west, the closest record is 650m away. Terrestrial habitat is suitable for Great Crested newts and there is no barrier to them travelling to the site except distance. Smooth Newts which are not a protected species are known to be present in the area.

#### **COMMUNITY FACILITIES ON SITE**

##### **Sports ground**

The sport ground on the west side of Bramford road is included within the red line. The extant permission includes a provision in the S106 that this land be transferred to the Council along with a sum of approximately £550,000 for reconfiguration and upgrading of the sports pitches to increase capacity and make way for the roundabout proposed at the junction of the site with Bramford Road. The SnOasis planning permission includes creation of a roundabout at this junction.

This current planning application proposes a staggered junction at this junction. A staggered junction is suitable for the traffic generated by the residential proposal. The residential proposal does not generate the need for a roundabout. Therefore, in order for the residential

scheme alone to proceed there is no physical need to install a roundabout or reconfigure the sports pitches. If the sports pitches do not need to be reconfigured then consideration can be given to whether this is the most appropriate location to upgrade the facilities in order to increase capacity.

However, the area of the sports field to be transferred to MSDC under the existing agreement does not include the land that would be required for a roundabout. Consequently when the sports field land is transferred to MSDC there will be a split in land ownership of the sports field site. The vast majority will be owned by MSDC and a small triangle including a corner of a football pitch will remain with the current owner of the land. This triangle has been offered to MSDC on a lease basis to enable the sports pitch to remain intact. If MSDC receives the sports field and a lease on the triangle and only the residential development is forthcoming then there is no physical need to reconfigure the sports field and the money allocated for this could be spent on a wider variety of sports provision to meet the needs generated by the housing development. Therefore, a S106 is being drafted on the basis of the sports field less the triangle being transferred to MSDC, the triangle being leased to MSDC and £537,000 commuted sum being paid to be spent on sports provision to serve the residents of the site.

As a precaution, £100,000 of the £537,000 is to be available for MSDC to call upon with a month's notice from the time of transfer of the sports field. Consequently, if for any reason MSDC finds itself in the position of having the sports field and needing to reconfigure it due to land ownership issues or highway works there will be a sum of money available to reconfigure the sports field to the current standard i.e. without any upgrade works. Once the time is reached where there is certainty over the need or otherwise for highway works to this junction, then if the money is not required for reconfiguration of the sports field it can be spent on increasing capacity of sports provision in the locality of the site.

#### Retail unit

The local centre shown on the extant permission has been reconfigured to provide a shop, a recycling point and an area of open space. Therefore, the application continues to include the opportunity for a convenience store at Great Blakenham and includes the recycling point and open space in a very similar manner to the extant permission. Provision of the shop prior to the occupation of the 29<sup>th</sup> dwelling (185<sup>th</sup> of overall development) can be secured by s106 agreement.

The application does not include any provision for the upper floor community uses or a police station at the local centre that are included in the extant permission. There do not appear to have been any identified confirmed occupiers for the community uses on the earlier application and no particular need has been identified as part of the current application. Therefore, the lack of community uses space in the current application does not warrant refusal of the current application. The application is for 276 dwellings. Combined with the development to be built under the existing planning permission this would make a total of 432 dwellings across the wider site. It would be difficult to make a case that a police station, albeit limited in size, is required to mitigate unacceptable impacts that could arise from 432 dwellings.

#### Hackneys Corner Open Space

The open space at Hackneys Corner is on highway land. In the extant permission this was referred to as a Village Green. Since that time there have been legislative changes regarding the matter of Village Greens. SCC Highways have no objection to the land being laid out and used as shown but have no intention of stopping up the highway rights over the land.

Therefore, the highway status of the land will always take precedence over any alternative use of the land. On this basis the land is not being proposed as having the formal status of a village green. The area of Hackneys Corner open space and the overall layout follows that of the extant permission. The long term management and maintenance of this space can be secured by condition.

#### Open Space and Play Areas

The scheme includes 0.76 ha of open space plus 0.12ha Hackneys Corner Piece. This is below the 1.25ha required by the OSSI policy. The on-site open space and play areas shown on the extant permission are included in the current application. Given the additional number of houses an additional area of open space has been included adjacent to Bramford Road. Although the on-site provision is lower than the normal policy requirement it is comparable to that on the extant permission. The application proposes £150,000 of children's play equipment. The play space and equipment proposed would offer a variety of equipment suitable for different ages. There are some concerns about the proposed planting and the layout of some of the play equipment. However, these matters can be addressed through a s106 agreement. The applicant proposes to retain and maintain the open space and play areas. The provision of the play equipment and the long term management and maintenance of the open space can be secured by s106 agreement.

### INFRASTRUCTURE

#### Health

The NHS has requested £63,000 to mitigate the need for extra health care provision to serve the residents of the development. The application includes provision of a commuted sum for this amount towards health care. The commuted sum would contribute to increasing capacity at Barham and Claydon Surgery.

The extant permission included approximately £100,000 commuted sum towards increasing the capacity at Needham Market Country Practice. £80,000 of this has been paid to MSDC and is in the process of being transferred to the NHS. The further £20,000 would not be triggered if the applicants cease building out the extant permission at 156 dwellings.

#### Police

The police have requested £209,976 towards the additional policing costs arising from the increase in population in the area including, one PCSO for three years £80,409, recruitment and equipping of staff £12,744, a police vehicle £20,750, automatic number plate recognition (ANPR) camera £60,073 and premises £36,000. It is understood that Great Blakenham PCSOs are based at MSDC offices. The current space occupied accommodates the current level of staff and an increase in staff would result in a need to review the space used at MSDC. The vehicle and ANPR would assist in mitigating the lack of police premises in Great Blakenham. The increase in staffing is based on the population growth that would result from the development. In making their request for an additional PCSO the police have taken into account the £130,000 funding for a Police Officer that they have already received from the development. The funding they have received is due to run out in June 2015. Police state that their funding is based on a three year projection of population. Therefore, they require a PCSO to be funded for 3 years until the increase in population is included in the police funding for the long term.

Due to the viability issues with the development there is insufficient funding proposed by the applicant to cover all the requests for the mitigation in respect of this application. Therefore, the applicant is not proposing any contribution towards mitigating the extra pressure the

development will place on police resources. The Police have had a contribution of £130,379 as part of the extant permission. However, there is other infrastructure that has not been provided. Therefore, it is recommended that the infrastructure that is yet to be provided is prioritised over further funding to the police. Consequently, it is not proposed to include and further funding for the police in the draft legal agreement. In addition it is proposed that the remaining clauses in the extant agreement requiring a police station and £80,000 commuted sum for the police are revoked.

#### Education

The County Council has requested £176,639 towards early years provision and £1,205,919 towards primary school education provision. This latter amount would be used towards increasing capacity at nearby existing primary schools. The applicant is proposing to provide these sums by way of a S106 agreement. The extant planning permission includes provision of a school on site. However, the County Council have commented that they are willing to remove their requirement for a school on site in favour of expanding nearby schools. The land that currently benefits from planning permission for a school is now proposed to provide housing development that will contribute to the housing land supply. The organisation of school provision is a County matter. Therefore, there does not appear to be reason to determine this application other than in accordance with current Education Authority requirements.

#### OSSI

The OSSI policy requires a total commuted sum of £1,864,360 towards open space sport and recreation including play areas £324,104, outdoor pitches £708,152, informal recreational space £103,632, village halls and community centre £288,544, swimming pools £97,536, sports halls £182,880, outdoor other sports pitches £137,160 and synthetic turf pitch £22,352.

The current application includes:

- £50,000 for the improvement, extension, enlargement or refurbishment of Great Blakenham community hall or parish rooms;
- 0.76 ha of open space on site plus 0.12ha Hackneys Corner Piece;
- £150,000 of play equipment;
- the transfer of the sports land to the council;
- £537,000 towards sports provision that could be used to fund outdoor pitches, sports halls, and swimming pools or other sports provision; and
- The applicant is proposing to retain and maintain the open space and play equipment.

The applicant's proposal can all be secured by conditions or s106 agreement.

The applicant is making the case that it is not viable to provide the full amount required by the OSSI policy. Although the applicant's proposal falls short of the OSSI policy the proposal includes the majority of such infrastructure that was included in the extant permission which pre-dates the OSSI policy.

The extant permission includes provision for:

- 1.1ha open space to be transferred to MSDC,
- approximately £200,000 towards open space laying out and maintenance,
- works to car park and fencing of sports field,
- transfer of sports field to MSDC,
- approximately £550,000 for reconfiguration of sports field,
- provide village green and transfer to MSDC with unspecified sum for maintenance.
- When planning permission was originally granted for housing development on the site

the S106 included provision for £50,000 towards Great Blakenham community hall or Great Blakenham parish rooms. However, this was altered to up to £17,208 OSSI commuted sum by a subsequent application and accompanying deed of variation.

However, the application is proposing more housing than the extant permission without providing additional OSSI infrastructure. In this case there is the benefit of the existing sports field being transferred into public hands to secure its long term future for community use. Taking account of the planning history and the viability issues with this development, the OSSI provision being proposed is considered to be sufficient to provide the residents with adequate social infrastructure to mitigate the harm that would result if such facilities were not provided.

#### Fire Fighting

The Fire and Rescue service have requested that fire hydrants are provided for the development. This can be secured by condition.

#### Sustainable Construction

The applicant is proposing that the scheme will meet Code for Sustainable Homes level 3 and that energy, water and resource efficiency measures will accord with those approved under the extant permission. These include: fittings and appliances being selected such that a maximum of 105 litres/person/day is achieved; recycling of rainwater run-off for irrigation; sustainable urban drainage system (SUDS); and a 25% improvement in carbon emissions over Target Emission Rate.

#### Bin storage and collection

SCC Waste Core Strategy Policy WDM17 requires provision is made for residents to sort, recycle and compost waste. Each house has private amenity space and space for bins and a composter. The flats have a refuse storage area. There is a recycling point proposed at the village centre.

### LEGAL AGREEMENT

The above results in a draft s106 agreement that will include provision for the following:

- 0.76ha public open space on site
- £150,000 children's play equipment to be provided by Orbit
- Long term management and maintenance of open space and play equipment by Orbit
- Sports field to be transferred to MSDC prior to commencement of development
- Triangle of corner of sports field to be licensed to MSDC at time of transfer of sports field
- £537,000 commuted sum for sports provision to include £100,000 to be drawn down on 30 days' notice at the MSDC request from time of transfer of sports field
- £50,000 commuted sum towards Great Blakenham Community Hall or Parish Rooms
- £63,000 to increase capacity at Claydon and Barham Surgery
- £1,382,558 commuted sum towards education and early years provision
- Provision of shop and marketing and letting strategy prior to occupation of 29<sup>th</sup> dwelling of this application (185<sup>th</sup> dwelling of overall site)
- Phasing
- Notify Councils of occupation at each trigger point
- MSDC monitoring fees
- Subject to Orbit providing the obligations set out above, MSDC and SCC to hold in abeyance enforcement action in respect of the comparable outstanding obligations in the extant agreement which have already been triggered

All financial contributions to be index linked

The extant agreement will be amended as follows:

- Provision of police station to be discharged
- Commuted sum of £80,000 for police provision to be discharged

The remainder of the extant agreement will remain as it stands.

### **PHASING**

The applicant is proposing to commence the development in 2015 and complete the build in 2021. It is proposed to build the dwellings at the following rate:

2015	30
2016	40
2017	48
2018	49
2019	49
2020	43
2021	17

The delivery of the public open space will be phased and provided as the housing around it is completed. The shop is to be provided prior to occupation of the 29<sup>th</sup> dwelling (185<sup>th</sup> of overall scheme).

The highway works are to be provided in accordance with a phasing plan to be submitted to and agreed by Suffolk County Council Highways.

The infrastructure to be secured by s106 agreement is to be provided in accordance with the following timetable:

Upon commencement	£25,000 of the Community Hall /Parish Rooms commuted sum
By April 2016	£25,000 of the Community Hall /Parish Rooms commuted sum
The sooner of occupation of 42 <sup>nd</sup> dwelling (198 <sup>th</sup> overall) or December 2016	£130,000 sports provision commuted sum £120,000 education commuted sum Transfer sports field and license of the triangle
The sooner of occupation of 112 <sup>th</sup> dwelling (268 <sup>th</sup> overall) or by April 2018	£250,000 education commuted sum
The sooner of occupation of 182 <sup>nd</sup> dwelling (338 <sup>th</sup> overall) or June 2019	£257,000 sports provision commuted sum £480,000 education commuted sum £63,000 health commuted sum
The sooner of occupation of 252 <sup>nd</sup> dwelling (408 <sup>th</sup> overall) or September 2020	£150,000 sports provision commuted sum £532,558 education commuted sum

The above phasing is based upon the availability of funds from the development and coordination of the provision of infrastructure.



**CONCLUSION**

The principle of developing the land in this location has already been established by the extant planning permission. The provision of additional housing will improve the housing land supply situation within the District.

The scheme should not result in a hazard or inconvenience to users of the public highway or have a significant impact on the wider highway network. The layout and design of the housing proposal is similar to the extant planning permission and the commercial unit with flats has regard for this design approach. Subject to the conditions the proposal should enable an adequate level of residential amenity to be provided to the potential occupiers and the existing residents. The proposal should not have an adverse impact on any identified biodiversity interests.

The viability work submitted is being accepted as demonstrating that the scheme can only fund a limited amount of infrastructure. Planning obligations should be used to mitigate the impact of unacceptable development to make it acceptable. Planning obligations must be necessary to make the development acceptable, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind. In this instance your officers have worked collaboratively with County officers over a considerable period of time to interrogate and assess the applicant's viability case and to identify and evaluate the planning impacts. On that basis County and District officers have worked together to identify reasonable obligations which are necessary, directly related and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development proposed. The proposed phasing will provide for the provision of community facilities and infrastructure as the development progresses.

For the reasons set out above the application is considered on balance to represent a sustainable, viable and deliverable scheme. Therefore, the application is recommended for approval subject to the conditions and planning obligations set out above.

**RECOMMENDATION**

**That authority be delegated to the Corporate Manager – Development Management to grant planning permission subject to the prior execution of a Section 106 planning obligation on terms to the satisfaction of the Corporate Manager – Development Management to secure the following heads of terms:**

- 0.76ha public open space on site
- £150,000 children's play equipment to be provided by Orbit
- Long term management and maintenance of open space and play equipment by Orbit
- Sports field to be transferred to MSDC prior to commencement of development
- Triangle of corner of sports field to be licensed to MSDC at time of transfer of sports field
- £537,000 commuted sum for sports provision to include £100,000 to be drawn down on 30 days' notice at the MSDC request from time of transfer of sports field
- £50,000 commuted sum towards Great Blakenham Community Hall or Parish Rooms
- £63,000 to increase capacity at Claydon and Barham Surgery
- £1,382,558 commuted sum towards education and early years provision
- Provision of shop and marketing and letting strategy prior to occupation of 29<sup>th</sup> dwelling of this application (185<sup>th</sup> dwelling of overall site)
- Phasing

- Notify Councils of occupation at each trigger point
- MSDC monitoring fees
- Subject to Orbit providing the obligations set out above, MSDC and SCC to hold in abeyance enforcement action in respect of the comparable outstanding obligations in the extant agreement which have already been triggered
- All financial contributions to be index linked
- The extant agreement will be amended to discharge the obligations to provide a police station and £80,000 commuted sum for police
- The remainder of the extant agreement will remain as it stands.

And that such permission be subject to the following conditions:

- 3 year time limit
- Approved plans
- Scheme of hard and soft landscaping for plots
- Scheme of hard and soft structural landscaping
- Tree protection in accordance with details submitted with application
- Scheme of hard and soft landscaping for Hackneys Corner Piece
- Management and maintenance of structural landscaping
- Land contamination remediation
- Noise assessment in relation to local centre
- Mechanical ventilation and air conditioning for retail unit
- Opening hours for retail unit: 07:00 until 23:00 Monday to Saturday and 10:00 until 16:00 Sundays and Bank Holidays
- Delivery hours for retail unit: 08:00 until 18:00 Monday to Saturday and no deliveries on Sundays or Bank Holidays
- Construction hours: 07:30 until 17:30 Monday to Friday, 08:00 until 13:00 on Saturdays and no working on Sundays or Bank Holidays
- Construction management plan to include no parking up or laying over of vehicles on Bramford Road, Gipping Road or Chapel Lane
- Provision of Fire hydrant/s
- Provision of Bramford Road junction prior to occupation of 4<sup>th</sup> dwelling (160<sup>th</sup> dwelling of overall site)
- Provision of highway works prior to occupation of 29<sup>th</sup> dwelling (185<sup>th</sup> dwelling of overall site)
- Details of estate roads and footpaths
- Construction of carriageways and footways to binder course level prior to occupation
- Provision and retention of areas for parking, loading and manoeuvring at local centre
- Garages only to be used for no other purpose than parking of vehicles
- Levels across site and to include finished floor levels
- Details of materials prior to commencement of development
- Scheme to demonstrate that water will not overflow onto Gipping Road or the level crossing
- Details of boundary treatments prior to commencement of development
- Shop unit be restricted to Class A1 use only
- Provision of travel plan

- Layout, provide and make available for us Hackneys Corner Piece prior to occupation of 29<sup>th</sup> dwelling (185<sup>th</sup> dwelling of overall site)
- Scheme for the long term management and maintenance of Hackneys Corner Piece
- Phasing scheme

Philip Isbell  
Corporate Manager - Development  
Management

## **APPENDIX A - PLANNING POLICIES**

### **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
- Cor3** - CS3 Reduce Contributions to Climate Change
- Cor4** - CS4 Adapting to Climate Change
- Cor5** - CS5 Mid Suffolks Environment
- Cor6** - CS6 Services and Infrastructure
- Cor7** - CS7 Brown Field Target
- Cor9** - CS9 Density and Mix
- 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
- CSFR-FC3** - SUPPLY OF EMPLOYMENT LAND

### **Mid Suffolk Local Plan**

- GP1** - DESIGN AND LAYOUT OF DEVELOPMENT
- H17** - KEEPING RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AWAY FROM POLLUTION
- CL8** - PROTECTING WILDLIFE HABITATS
- RT12** - FOOTPATHS AND BRIDLEWAYS
- CL9** - RECOGNISED WILDLIFE AREAS
- SB2** - DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATE TO ITS SETTING
- H8** - REPLACEMENT DWELLINGS IN THE COUNTRYSIDE
- H13** - DESIGN AND LAYOUT OF HOUSING DEVELOPMENT
- H14** - A RANGE OF HOUSE TYPES TO MEET DIFFERENT ACCOMMODATION NEEDS
- H15** - DEVELOPMENT TO REFLECT LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS
- H16** - PROTECTING EXISTING RESIDENTIAL AMENITY
- E6** - RETENTION OF INDIVIDUAL INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL SITES
- S5** - LIVING ACCOMMODATION ABOVE SHOPS AND OTHER COMMERCIAL PREMISES
- S7** - PROVISION OF LOCAL SHOPS
- S8** - SHOP FRONT DESIGN
- S10** - CONVENIENCE GOODS STORES
- T4** - PLANNING OBLIGATIONS AND HIGHWAYS INFRASTRUCTURE
- T9** - PARKING STANDARDS

- T10 - HIGHWAY CONSIDERATIONS IN DEVELOPMENT
- T11 - FACILITIES FOR PEDESTRIANS AND CYCLISTS
- RT1 - SPORTS AND RECREATION FACILITIES FOR LOCAL COMMUNITIES
- RT5 - RECREATIONAL FACILITIES AS PART OF OTHER DEVELOPMENT
- RT14 - ART IN PUBLIC PLACES
- SC6 - RECYCLING CENTRES

**Planning Policy Statements, Circulars & Other policy**

**NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework**

## **APPENDIX B - NEIGHBOUR REPRESENTATIONS**

Letter(s) of representation(s) have been received from a total of **17** interested party(ies).

The following people **objected** to the application

The following people **supported** the application:

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