

Public Document Pack



	PLANNING REFERRALS COMMITTEE
DATE:	WEDNESDAY, 29 JANUARY 2020 9.30 AM
VENUE:	KING EDMUND CHAMBER - ENDEAVOUR HOUSE, 8 RUSSELL ROAD, IPSWICH

For consideration at the meeting on Wednesday, 29 JANUARY 2020, the following additional or updated papers that were unavailable when the Agenda was printed.

TABLED PAPERS

		<u>Page(s)</u>
7A	DC/19/03486 LAND SOUTH WEST OF, BEYTON ROAD, THURSTON, SUFFOLK	3 - 8
7B	DC/19/02090 LAND TO THE EAST OF, IXWORTH ROAD, THURSTON, SUFFOLK	9 - 16
8B	1856/17 LAND NORTH WEST OF, CHURCH LANE, BARHAM, SUFFOLK	17 - 20
8C	DC/18/00861 LAND TO THE EAST OF, ELY ROAD, CLAYDON, SUFFOLK	21 - 22

For more information about this meeting, including access arrangements and facilities for people with disabilities, please contact the Committee Officer, Robert Carmichael - 01449 724930 - committees@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk on: 01449 724930 or Email: Committees@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 7a

LATE PAPERS

DC/19/03486 Beyton Road, Thurston

Thurston Parish Council further response following publication of Committee report [28 January 2020]

The Parish Council is writing further to request that the following matters, relating to the documents being presented to the Referrals Committee, be brought to the attention of the case officer and be added to the pack of papers being presented to members of the committee determining the applications on Wednesday 29th January 2020.

Thurston Parish Council continues to object to this application on grounds with specific matters detailed below:

Thurston's Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP)

Thurston NDP was adopted unanimously by members of Mid Suffolk's District Council (MSDC) in October 2019 and as has been stated has statutory weight which alongside the rest of the development plan must be the starting point for decision making.

However, given that the adopted Local Plan Core Strategy and Core Strategy Focused Review has policies which are deemed to be 'out-of-date' and inconsistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), the balance in favour of granting planning permission as identified by paragraph 11 of the NPPF must tip the balance the other way as the adverse impacts of doing so will significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the most relevant adopted plan.

The Thurston Neighbourhood Plan prevails the publication of the Joint Local Plan Consultation Document which has just completed Regulation 18 phase. Whilst the site has been included as a proposed site allocation within the Joint Local Plan, limited weight should be given to proposals for its development until all objections to this policy have been fully determined.

The Parish Council draws reference to paragraph 14 of the NPPF which requires applications to be refused where it can be demonstrated that the adverse impact of allowing development that conflicts with the neighbourhood plan is likely to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, and maintains that the conditions prescribed under 14 apply in the determination of these applications:

- a) the neighbourhood plan became part of the development plan two years or less before the date on which the decision is made;
- b) the neighbourhood plan contains policies and allocations to meet its identified housing requirement;
- c) the local planning authority has at least a three-year supply of deliverable housing sites (against its five-year housing supply requirement, including the appropriate buffer as set out in paragraph 73); and
- d) the local planning authority's housing delivery was at least 45% of that required over the previous three years.

MSDC has, within its Mid Suffolk District Council Housing Land Supply Position Statement 2019/20 – 2023/24 (September 2019) confirmed (Paragraph 10.4 and 10.5) that, as required by the Framework (Paragraph 73 and Glossary in Annex 2) and in accordance with the guidance set out in the Framework and accompanying Guidance, demonstrated that it has a 5.66 years housing land supply.

- Highway Improvements – Mount Road - the Parish Council maintains that the package of improvements are limited in scope with physical evidence being confined to the doming of the roundabout at the Fox and Hounds junction on Barton Road. The main reason as to why the previous proposals for Mount Road are now redundant is that Suffolk County Council did not have ownership of the land to achieve the proposals now being offered by the applicant. This has little benefit apart from the claim that this will allow cars out onto Mount Road at a quicker rate. As such, given that this is the only justification for ruling out the previously agreed deliverable proposals (from the Thurston Five), the Parish Council holds that the premise of roads driving this development is the Officer's reason for approval.

The impact of allowing roads to drive development has a range of demonstrably harmful environmental impacts as it fails to halt carbon emissions that are fuelling global heating.

- Climate impact – Mid Suffolk District Council, at its meeting on 25th July, voted on motions to support Suffolk's county-wide aim of becoming carbon neutral by 2030. It was claimed that this would give (MSDC) the mandate we need help the Government to deliver its 25-year Environment Plan and increase the powers and resources available to local authorities to address climate change.

This proposal demonstrates no measures to discourage the use of cars for residents to travel to work. The use of vehicles to access areas of employment outside of the village – as this proposal fails to offer any employment opportunities - will increase congestion and carbon emissions.

The Parish Council questions the desire to respond positively to the climate change challenge as this proposal fails to encourage residents out of their cars.

- Barrow Foot Crossing at Thurston Railway Station – in November 2017, in response to the cumulative impact from the "Thurston Five", Mid Suffolk was tasked with finding a solution to the Barrow Foot Crossing which Network Rail had stated that it would recommend closure unless mitigation and measures were introduced to counter additional usage. To date no solution has been found apart from the requirement for new residents to be issued with advice on how to cross the foot crossing. On similar crossings with identical safety measures, businessmen have been seen crossing the lines even with alarms and horns sounding.

Network Rail has a standard Risk Assessment tool caked ALCRM (All Level Crossing Risk Model) which determined the predictive level of risk at a level crossing. In 2015, the ALCRM for the crossing in Thurston was D4, in 2017 200 pedestrians were predicted to take the level to a risk factor of D3.

In a recent census carried out by Network Rail (October 2019) of the numbers using the Barrow Foot Crossing, the numbers using the crossing actually placed it into the High Risk Category on 2 out of the 9 days where data was recorded and almost touched 200 on a 3 further days.

A response submitted on 30th August 2019 to the MSDC Planning Team for Application DC/19/03486 by Mr Donaghue stated that this proposal will have a “negative impact on Thurston Level Crossing” and that Network Rail believe that as this proposal is contributing to the risk, the applicant should contribute to the new access.

The Case Officer for the above application in his Officer Report to the Committee report states that Network Rail is actively engaging with the Council and the Applicants to explore potential solutions to enhancing rail user safety at the station and that it is expected that Network Rail will support the proposed improvements under the rail bridge and that it is currently being explored as to whether a ramp/lift can be installed on the south side of the station as a future access enhancement using contributions from CIL funding.

The Parish Council is obviously concerned that this application is coming before a committee for determination with no concrete proposals on the table to support any measures to enhance rail user safety at the station despite Network Rail’s own Town Planning Technician having stated that this proposal will have a negative impact and the Case Officer for the application merely recommending a contribution from the applicant themselves to contribute a sum of money towards commissioning a feasibility/design study to achieve a non-costed and (to date) non identifiable solution.

The Parish Council questions whether the money being offered by the applicant - £30,000 - is sufficient to fund a feasibility / design study and why Mid Suffolk Planners have not sought to ensure that a fully costed and achievable solution is in place prior to the approval of not only this application but also the one for land to the east of Ixworth Road.

In a response as to whether Network Rail was aware that a further planning application for 210 houses to the north of Thurston has also been submitted (as there is no response on file for application DC/19/02090, the Route Level Crossing Manager for Network Rail Anglia confirmed that he would speak with his planning department to check if we (Network Rail) have objected to any forthcoming applications, as they would cause Network Rail concerns.

The Parish Council contends that the District Council should be aware that infrastructure, such as rail, needs to be addressed in Thurston prior to the approval of further planning applications and requires collaborative working with infrastructure providers to ensure fully costed solutions are capable of being delivered.

- Thedwastre Bridge – in Section 4 of the response from SCC Highways Department (letter dated 7th January 2020) it is stated that the proposed mitigation is that further improvements can be made for pedestrians and yet it also describes the bridge as having significant limitations.

The Parish Council maintains that there is very limited scope to improve the safety of pedestrians and cyclists without further narrowing the bridge for vehicles and that as there is no formal footway over the rail bridge, pedestrians and cyclists will be sharing the road with vehicles within a single land priority system.

There are concerns that approval is to be granted on the assumption that further options could be explored.

As the bridge will become a major route for those accessing the village’s facilities, services and schools the impact on vulnerable users has been ignored and the applications have failed to demonstrate that their proposal will not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety and the safety of all road users especially the most vulnerable.

- Pokeridge Corner – the Parish Council challenges the assumption that visibility is the major cause of delay. This might hold true for accidents at this junction, but it is felt that the major factor for delay is the amount of traffic along with traffic flows. Analysis of this junction with the committed and proposed developments shows that it will operate above the desirable capacity limits.

It is challenged as to whether the proposed mitigation measures of installing an uncontrolled crossing with improved visibility to one corner of the junction will reduce vehicle speeds or render the junction safer.

The assumption that the Beyton Road development will have minimal impact in terms of capacity on this junction is also challenged. By a further increase in numbers (of some or more) accessing this junction from the Beyton Road development will ensure that the situation will become severe.

- A143 / Bunbury Arms Junction – the Parish Council challenges the assumption made by Suffolk County Council (SCC) Highways Department that it is likely that, due to its location south of the railway line, the impact from this development on this junction will be minimal. It should be noted in the response submitted by the Highways Department that after traffic flows have been generated from the committed sites (2017); growth patterns and new trips from the proposed developments, this junction, with the proposed mitigation scheme, is still predicted to be over capacity.

The Parish Council believes that the comment from SCC Highways Department which states that there is only a possibility of scope to improve the proposed preliminary design of the signals using better software and monitoring systems to improve capacity, demonstrates sufficiently that this development will result in a severe impact in terms of highway capacity. Additionally, SCC Highways Department states that there is no further mitigation, in terms of highway layout, considered possible within the highway boundary.

The impact of this development as well as the one to the East of Ixworth Road will be to create a knock-on effect in Thurston for traffic being held up at this junction. Locally there is evidence that traffic is attempting to avoid this junction by accessing Thurston from Ixworth along Ixworth and Norton Road.

- Barton Road Mini Roundabout and Rail Bridge/Beyton Road Junction Rail Bridge – the Parish Council contends that the realignment of the carriageway under the railway bridge to increase the footway width to 1.5 metres whilst maintaining access under the bridge for larger vehicles is not a suitable solution to ensure safety of pedestrians as the footway is of insufficient size to render it safe for all users,. This is of particular relevant to vulnerable users given that it is situated next to a very busy road. The Parish Council questions why the width of the footway at 1.5metres has been deemed acceptable when other developments are required to install shared-use paths which supports walking, bicycling and people in wheelchairs.

It should also be noted that whilst the proposals are to provide a number of crossings points along Beyton Road to link to the existing footway little account has been taken of the current widths of the existing footpaths and their suitability for increased pedestrian movements from this site – for example the footpath at Royston Drive has a maximum width of 1.17 metres whilst the footpath along Thedwastre Road reduces from 1.12 metres down to 1.00 metres, both of which are below current guidelines.

The Parish Council is furthermore concerned that the Officer Report on the proposals being offered, dismisses Policy 6 of the Thurston NDP by stating that that the situation for cyclists using this route remains unchanged from the existing situation and fails to consider that this route will be one of the prime routes for those accessing both the Primary School and College using sustainable means.

The Parish Council would also like to state that the drawing produced by Cannon Consulting Engineers in their reports and as replicated by SCC Highways Department in its response of 7th January 2020 (Drawing Ref X601_PL-214) is very misleading as it implies the realignment of the road will allow for a coach, bus and parent and child to traverse through the bridge at the same time. A typical coach used by the College is much higher than that shown in the diagram and an unrepresentatively small bus gives the impression that a bus and car can pass under the bridge simultaneously. The reality is that this is a one-way passage when a bus, lorry or agricultural vehicle pass and that such vehicles move to the centre of the road to pass under the bridge. The Parish Council is concerned at the interpretation that this might give, and the impartiality of the data provided to MSDC.

- Precedent - as has been stated previously this application is outside of the settlement boundary of the Thurston adopted NDP and as such in conflict with the Thurston NDP. The precedent for refusal as contrary to Thurston's adopted NDP has been established with refusal of planning applications DC/19/05513 and DC/19/05465.

To summarise, given the evidence identified above, the Parish Council contends that the minor benefits of the proposal does not outweigh the significant adverse economic, social and environments impacts that will be had and that insufficient measures have been identified to reduce or eliminate these impacts and that this application should be refused.

SCC Minerals

Following my previous consultation return I have had the opportunity to speak to the authors of the Environmental Study and Minerals Assessment. I would like to update my advice, specifically the recommended condition, to reflect the agreed outcome of those discussions.

Condition: incidental extraction of minerals

The first application for approval of reserved matters shall include a minerals management plan detailing the incidental extraction of mineral resources to be approved by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Minerals Planning Authority. The plan shall provide:

- a summary of existing ground investigation information with respect to the classification of site-won minerals and the determination of their quality;
- an assessment of the extent to which minerals extracted are suitable for use in the construction of the development;
- details of likely site-won volumes, requirements for filling works, and the methods for managing any surpluses;
- drawings and/or figures as necessary to illustrate those methods.

The minerals management plan shall be carried out in full in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: to prevent the needless sterilisation of mineral resources and in accordance with paragraphs 203-206 of the NPPF and Policy MP10 of the Suffolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

SCC Developer Contributions

17 January 2020

I have previously submitted a consultation response letter dated 30 July 2019. This letter provides an update in respect of the section 106 contributions for early years and primary education provision.

Summary of infrastructure requirements split between CIL/S106:

CIL	Education	
	- Secondary school expansion	£841,306
	- sixth form expansion	£181,904
CIL	Libraries improvement	£45,360
CIL	Waste infrastructure	£23,100
S106	Education	
	- new primary school land cost	£67,288
	- new primary school build cost	£875,108
S106	New early years build cost	£340,074
S106	Highways	tbc

Network Rail

A verbal update will be provided on the basis that discussion is ongoing between the Council and NR with a view to identifying a solution to improving platform accessibility that will allow the existing barrow crossing to be closed. NR currently has a holding objection to the proposal on the basis of additional passenger generation at Thurston Station [from the development] and this will increase the use of the barrow crossing. A number of options for resolving this are currently being explored and it is expected that CIL will be made available to support implementation of a solution.

TYPO corrections:

P53 ..this will **'lead'** to more vehicles not leaded

P69 ..toady's should read **'today's'** agenda

Agenda Item 7b

LATE PAPERS

DC/19/02090 East of Ixworth Road, Thurston

Thurston Parish Council further response following publication of Committee report [28 January 2020]

The Parish Council is writing further to request that the following matters, relating to the documents being presented to the Referrals Committee, be brought to the attention of the case officer and be added to the pack of papers being presented to members of the committee determining the applications on Wednesday 29th January 2020.

Thurston Parish Council continues to object to this application on grounds that are common to application DC/19/03486 as detailed below:

Thurston's Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP)

Thurston NDP was adopted unanimously by members of Mid Suffolk's District Council (MSDC) in October 2019 and as has been stated has statutory weight which alongside the rest of the development plan must be the starting point for decision making.

However, given that the adopted Local Plan Core Strategy and Core Strategy Focused Review has policies which are deemed to be 'out-of-date' and inconsistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), the balance in favour of granting planning permission as identified by paragraph 11 of the NPPF must tip the balance the other way as the adverse impacts of doing so will significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the most relevant adopted plan.

The Thurston Neighbourhood Plan prevails the publication of the Joint Local Plan Consultation Document which has just completed Regulation 18 phase. Whilst the site has been included as a proposed site allocation within the Joint Local Plan, limited weight should be given to proposals for its development until all objections to this policy have been fully determined.

The Parish Council draws reference to paragraph 14 of the NPPF which requires applications to be refused where it can be demonstrated that the adverse impact of allowing development that conflicts with the neighbourhood plan is likely to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, and maintains that the conditions prescribed under 14 apply in the determination of these applications:

- a) the neighbourhood plan became part of the development plan two years or less before the date on which the decision is made;
- b) the neighbourhood plan contains policies and allocations to meet its identified housing requirement;

- c) the local planning authority has at least a three-year supply of deliverable housing sites (against its five-year housing supply requirement, including the appropriate buffer as set out in paragraph 73); and
- d) the local planning authority's housing delivery was at least 45% of that required over the previous three years.

MSDC has, within its Mid Suffolk District Council Housing Land Supply Position Statement 2019/20 – 2023/24 (September 2019) confirmed (Paragraph 10.4 and 10.5) that, as required by the Framework (Paragraph 73 and Glossary in Annex 2) and in accordance with the guidance set out in the Framework and accompanying Guidance, demonstrated that it has a 5.66 years housing land supply.

- Climate impact – Mid Suffolk District Council, at its meeting on 25th July, voted on motions to support Suffolk's county-wide aim of becoming carbon neutral by 2030. It was claimed that this would give (MSDC) the mandate we need help the Government to deliver its 25-year Environment Plan and increase the powers and resources available to local authorities to address climate change.

This proposal demonstrates no measures to discourage the use of cars for residents to travel to work.

The use of vehicles to access areas of employment outside of the village – as this proposal fails to offer any employment opportunities - will increase congestion and carbon emissions.

The Parish Council questions the desire to respond positively to the climate change challenge as this proposal fails to encourage residents out of their cars.

- Barrow Foot Crossing at Thurston Railway Station – in November 2017, in response to the cumulative impact from the "Thurston Five", Mid Suffolk was tasked with finding a solution to the Barrow Foot Crossing which Network Rail had stated that it would recommend closure unless mitigation and measures were introduced to counter additional usage. To date no solution has been found apart from the requirement for new residents to be issued with advice on how to cross the foot crossing. On similar crossings with identical safety measures, businessmen have been seen crossing the lines even with alarms and horns sounding Network Rail has a standard Risk Assessment tool called ALCRM (All Level Crossing Risk Model) which determined the predictive level of risk at a level crossing. In 2015, the ALCRM for the crossing in Thurston was D4, in 2017 200 pedestrians were predicted to take the level to a risk factor of D3.

In a recent census carried out by Network Rail (October 2019) of the numbers using the Barrow Foot Crossing, the numbers using the crossing actually placed it into the High-Risk Category on 2 out of the 9 days where data was recorded and almost touched 200 on 3 further days.

A response submitted on 30th August 2019 to the MSDC Planning Team for Application DC/19/03486 by Mr Donaghue stated that this proposal will have a “negative impact on Thurston Level Crossing” and that Network Rail believe that as this proposal is contributing to the risk, the applicant should contribute to the new access.

The Case Officer for the above application in his Officer Report to the Committee report states that Network Rail is actively engaging with the Council and the Applicants to explore potential solutions to enhancing rail user safety at the station and that it is expected that Network Rail will support the proposed improvements under the rail bridge and that it is currently being explored as to whether a ramp/lift can be installed on the south side of the station as a future access enhancement using contributions from CIL funding.

The Parish Council is obviously concerned that this application is coming before a committee for determination with no concrete proposals on the table to support any measures to enhance rail user safety at the station despite Network Rail’s own Town Planning Technician having stated that this proposal will have a negative impact and the Case Officer for the application merely recommending a contribution from the applicant themselves to contribute a sum of money towards commissioning a feasibility/design study to achieve a non-costed and (to date) non identifiable solution.

The Parish Council questions whether the money being offered by the applicant - £30,000 - is sufficient to fund a feasibility / design study and why Mid Suffolk Planners have not sought to ensure that a fully costed and achievable solution is in place prior to the approval of not only this application but also the one for land to the east of Ixworth Road.

In a response as to whether Network Rail was aware that a further planning application for 210 houses to the north of Thurston has also been submitted (as there is no response on file for application DC/19/02090, the Route Level Crossing Manager for Network Rail Anglia confirmed that he would speak with his planning department to check if we (Network Rail) have objected to any forthcoming applications, as they would cause Network Rail concerns.

The Parish Council contends that the District Council should be aware that infrastructure, such as rail, needs to be addressed in Thurston prior to the approval of further planning applications and requires collaborative working with infrastructure providers to ensure fully costed solutions are capable of being delivered. With particular reference to this application, the Council’s additional comments are as follows:

- A143 / Bunbury Arms Junction – the Parish Council accepts the assumption made by Suffolk County Council (SCC) Highways Department that, due to its location north of the railway line, the impact from this development on this junction will present an unacceptable strain on the highway network.

It should be noted in the response submitted by the Highways Department that after traffic flows have been generated from the committed sites (2017); growth patterns

and new trips from the proposed developments, this junction, with the proposed mitigation scheme, is still predicted to be over capacity.

The Parish Council believes that the comment from SCC Highways Department which states that there is only a possibility of scope to improve the proposed preliminary design of the signals using better software and monitoring systems to improve capacity, demonstrates sufficiently that this development will result in a severe impact in terms of highway capacity. Additionally, SCC Highways Department states that there is no further mitigation, in terms of highway layout, considered possible within the highway boundary. The impact of this development as well as the one on Beyton Road will be to create a knock-on effect in Thurston for traffic being held up at this junction. Locally there is evidence that traffic is attempting to avoid this junction by accessing Thurston from Ixworth along Ixworth and Norton Road.

- Impact on the following junctions: the Parish Council is concerned at the Officer Statement at 3.48 of his report which challenges the reasoning as to why this application should be granted permission with no mitigation measures proposed for:

Barton Road Mini Roundabout and Rail Bridge/Beyton Road Junction Rail Bridge
Thurston Road/Thurston Road Junction (Fishwick Corner)
Beyton Road/Thurston Road/Thedwastre Road Crossroads (Pokeriage Corner)
and draws reference to the arguments that have been previously rehearsed about traffic flows within the village.

The Parish Council challenges the reasoning behind the lack of mitigation measures for the traffic impact at all junctions to the south of the railway line as it cannot be assumed that traffic at these junctions will not increase due to residents from this development accessing the A14 for trips to Ipswich, Bury St Edmunds and further afield for work, facilities, leisure and services. This assessment should be carried out and should, in light of the changes in SCC's School Transport Policy given that Thurston Community College's large predominately rural catchment area will generate extra trips, particularly to and from the north of the village, take into account traffic flows around, in and out of Thurston.

- Pakenham Crossroads – given the location of this development, the Parish Council is concerned as to why Suffolk County Council has not sought to look at the cumulative impact on this crossroads given the location of not only this site but also the one to the west of Ixworth Road.

Concerns have been raised by not only the Parish Council but also Pakenham Parish Council, the District Councillor for Pakenham and the County Councillor for the Ward in which Pakenham sits as to the impact further growth will have on this junction in terms of capacity and visibility.

- Norton Road/Ixworth Road – again the Parish Council is concerned to note that there has been no assessment of the impact that this development will have on these crossroads.
- Access and visibility – MSDC Planning Department has, based on comments received from SCC Highways Department, previously refused applications at Cedars

Close along Ixworth Road, on grounds of poor visibility. The Parish Council has seen no evidence that suggests that better visibility splays can be achieved and challenges the assumption that safe access can be achieved for all users of the highway at this point in the village.

- Open Space – given the location of the open space to the northern edge of the site where it adjoins the open countryside, there will be limited community value to the residents of Thurston and as such the development will be disconnected from the village and fail to adhere to the objectives and policies of the Thurston NDP.
- Travel Plan – whilst the Parish Council notes that there is to be Travel Plan monitoring sum, it questions why no travel plan has been submitted. The Parish Council is aware that any travel plan will only diminish the number of vehicles using the highway network by a limited amount – the Framework Travel Plan produced by Cannon Consulting Engineers for Bloor for example states that if all its recommendations are implemented there will be a slight reduction in the travel plans of 10%.
- SCC Highways Department Conclusion – the Parish Council concurs with the conclusion as written by SCC Highways Department (letter dated 7th January 2020) that there will be a cumulative severe impact from this proposal and that there are unacceptable impacts on road safety for all users.
- Precedent - as has been stated previously this application is outside of the settlement boundary of the Thurston adopted NDP and as such in conflict with the Thurston NDP. The precedent for refusal as contrary to Thurston's adopted NDP has been established with refusal of planning applications DC/19/05513 and DC/19/05465.

The Parish Council maintains that as this development will lead to more vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists using the highway, insufficient evidence has been produced to show that mitigation measures will be able to reduce the severe impact and that it fails to adhere to the key objectives in Thurston's NDP.

Given the further evidence identified above, the Parish Council contends that the minor benefits of the proposal do not outweigh the significant adverse economic, social and environments impacts that will be had and that insufficient measures have been identified to reduce or eliminate these impacts and that this application should be refused.

SCC Floods & Water

24 January 2020

House builders and planning agents have expressed their frustration that some of the sites that they are looking to purchase to develop simply do not have sufficient space allocated for full open Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs) or in some cases a surface water drainage system that meet the minimum requirements of national and local policy/guidance, whilst delivering the number of dwellings required by the LPA. This has led to some sites being dropped by house builders, viability assessments being undertaken to justify hybrid SuDs or amendments to extend the

red line plan to accommodate the surface water drainage assets and level of housing required to make the site viable.

This has led to applicants having to undertake unnecessary additional work on sites that have already been granted outline planning applications. Which then results in start dates being delayed and additional expense for consultants.

The LLFA has recognised this issue and working with land promoters and house builders they will be introducing interim guidance for the requirement of SuDS to ensure that;

1. existing outline planning applications incorporate as much SuDs as possible, whilst being mindful of existing site constraints
2. future outline planning applications are planned to ensuring that sufficient space for full above ground open SuDs are allowed for, unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate e.g. land topography, geology, etc

The LLFA's interim guidance for the requirement of SuDS for outline planning applications is envisaged to be published late Feb 2020.

SCC Floods & Water is satisfied that the proposed development will not pose a flood risk. However, they have maintained a holding objection on surface water drainage grounds. Having discussed their position it can be reported that the applicants have proposed a viable hybrid surface drainage solution that is satisfactory from a drainage engineering point. This utilises adjacent water courses and an on-site SuDS pond. The holding objection is based on the fact that the NPPF seeks a full SuDS solution as first preference. That said SCC Floods & Water accept that it is the planning authority's role to interpret the NPPF for planning purposes. It is suggested that an additional condition be added [if Members are minded to grant pp] requiring further submission of a FULL SuDS Strategy Statement prior to or simultaneously with RM. That strategy shall inform final RM layout. The applicant must in the event of a FULL SuDS solution not being possible justify a HYBRID solution to the satisfaction of the lpa.

SCC Developer Contributions

I previously submitted a consultation response letter dated 12 November 2019. This letter provides an update in respect of the section 106 contributions for early years and primary education provision.

Summary of infrastructure requirements split between CIL/S106:

CIL	Education	
	- Secondary school expansion	£841,306
	- sixth form expansion	£181,904
CIL	Libraries improvement	£45,360
CIL	Waste infrastructure	£23,100
S106	Education	
	- new primary school land cost	£67,288
	- new primary school build cost	£875,108
S106	New early years build cost	£340,074
S106	Highways	tbc

Network Rail

A verbal update will be provided on the basis that discussion is ongoing between the Council and NR with a view to identifying a solution to improving platform accessibility that will allow the existing barrow crossing to be closed. NR currently has a holding objection to the proposal on the basis of additional passenger generation at Thurston Station [from the development] and this will increase the use of the barrow crossing. A number of options for resolving this are currently being explored and it is expected that CIL will be made available to support implementation of a solution.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 8b

Tabled Papers: 1856/17 - Land North West Of, Church Lane, Barham, Suffolk

Description of Development

Outline planning application (with all matters reserved except for access and spine road) for phased development for the erection of up to 269 dwellings and affordable housing, together with associated access and spine road including works to Church Lane, doctor's surgery site, amenity space including an extension to the Church grounds, reserved site for Pre-School and Primary School and all other works and infrastructure (amended description).

Update to recommendation

Page 708 (para 12.2) and 714 (Recommendation) – Minor clarification to recommendation to ensure 'securing site for primary school' included in these paragraphs. The S106 agreement would secure the site for the school as is already stated in paragraph 4.14 of the report, this update simply ensures it is reflected in the final wording of the recommendation too. The recommendation therefore reads as follows:

RECOMMENDATION

That the application is GRANTED planning permission and includes the following conditions:-

That authority be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer to APPROVE OUTLINE PERMISSION

(1) Subject to the prior agreement of a Section 106 Planning Obligation on appropriate terms to the satisfaction of the Chief Planning Officer to secure:

- Affordable housing
 - o This shall include not less than 35% of total dwellings
 - o Properties must be built to current Homes England requirements and NDSS 2015 and Lifetime-Homes standards
 - o The council is granted 100% nomination rights to all the affordable units on first lets and 75% on subsequent lets.
 - o The affordable units will be built out in phases across the development to be agreed at Reserved Matters stage if the outline application is approved. The indicative plan showing the location of the affordable homes is seen as acceptable with dwellings distributed across the site.
 - o Shared Ownership units to a maximum initial share purchase threshold to be agreed through S106
 - o Affordable housing units must be transferred freehold to an approved RP or to the district Council.
 - o Where there are more than 15 affordable units, they should not be located in clusters of more than 15 units.
 - o Adequate parking provision is made for the affordable housing units
- On site open space and includes management of the space to be agreed and requirement for public access at all times.
- Providing land and contribution to Church within their extended grounds - £60,000 (for info provisions of laying of carpark, access route to/from church, footpath link relating to archaeology will be covered by planning condition)
- Recreational Access Disturbance Mitigation Strategy contribution - £121.89 per dwelling

- Primary school build cost - £1,232,175 **and securing site for primary school**
- Improvements to Church Lane Claydon/Norwich Road junction and Station Road/Norwich Road junction; Financial contribution toward transport improvements in the village to encourage walking and cycling, safer routes to school and improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists; and Norwich Road extension of Speed Limit on Norwich Road. The total cost of these works are estimated at £98,250 to be apportioned between this and Norwich Road application (reference 18/00861).
- Travel Plan Travel Plan Evaluation and Support Contribution - £1,000 per annum from occupation of the 100th dwelling for a minimum of five years, or one year after occupation of the final dwelling, whichever is the longest duration.
- Public Rights of Way improvements £115,500
- Protect land for potential doctor's surgery/community use for period of time before releasing to other uses (i.e. residential) if not successfully taken up

(2) That the Chief Planning Officer be authorised to APPROVE Planning Permission upon completion of the legal agreement subject to conditions as summarised below and those as may be deemed necessary by the Chief Planning Officer:

- Reduced outline time limit
- Approved Plans (Plans submitted that form this application)
- Phasing Condition (To allow phasing of the development and allows spreading of payments under CIL).
- Market housing mix prior to or concurrent with reserved matters to be agreed
- Landscaping conditions including advance planting (before commencement of construction), landscape management plan and landscaping scheme
- Tree protection
- SuDS implementation, management and maintenance plans
- Ecology protection, mitigation and enhancement measures including follow-up badger survey, Skylark mitigation, wildlife sensitive lighting scheme, Swift boxes and hedgehog fencing
- Level access to enable wheelchair access for all dwellings/buildings
- Used Water Sewerage Network – phasing plan, foul water strategy and Surface Water Disposal (Anglian Water)
- Access route to/from church and footpath link
- Programme of archaeological works
- Management Plan for the Preservation of Archaeological Features in specified area – no dig/build up and no ground disturbance. No groundworks (including ploughing, site stripping, landscaping, planting, services, fencing, attenuation or machinery movement) to protect in-situ archaeological remains
- Highways conditions including; Visibility splays, Travel Plan, Road Safety Audits, manoeuvring and parking details (including electric vehicle charging points and cycle storage), details of estate roads, surface water disposal from highway, refuse/recycling bin details, Construction Environment Management Plan
- Landscaping including proposed tree planting and landscaping, including locations and root management (relating to highways)
- Surface water drainage scheme including maintenance and management, construction surface water management plan and inclusion of SuDS components on Lead Local Flood Authority's Flood Risk Asset Register
- Noise mitigation from A14

- Land contamination
- Service ducting for broadband
- Fire hydrants
- Energy and renewable integration scheme
- Rainwater harvesting
- Land contamination investigation and remediation
- Arboricultural method statement and tree protection plan
- Minerals extraction recording

(3) And the following informative notes as summarised and those as may be deemed necessary by the Chief Planning Officer:

- Pro active working statement
- SCC Highways: offence to carry out works in public highway
- SCC Highways: Section 38 agreement required relating to construction and adoption of Estate Roads.
- SCC Highways: existing street lighting system, contact SCC
- Public Rights of Way - notes reminding of legal requirements protecting rights of way
- Anglian Water assets
- Connection to public sewer requires consent under S106 of the Water Industry Act 1991
- Works to a water course may require consent under the Land Drainage Act
- Discharge to a watercourse or groundwater needs to comply with Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) Regulations 2003
- Discharge to watercourse that drains into an Internal Drainage Board catchment may require a contribution

(4) That in the event of the Planning obligations or requirements referred to in Resolution (1) above not being secured and/or not secured within 6 months of this resolution along with an appropriate extension of time to the application to ensure such obligation/requirements are secured in a timely manner that the Chief Planning Officer be authorised to refuse the application on appropriate ground/s

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 8c

Tabled Papers: 18/00861 – Land to east of Ely Road, Claydon, Suffolk

Description of Development

Outline Planning Application (with means of access to be considered) - Erection of up to 73 dwellings, public open space and supporting site infrastructure including access.

Update to recommendation

Page 979: Paragraph 5.25 refers to final comments from SCC Highways being awaited, but these have been received (page 1060 in Appendix 5) and raise no objection subject to conditions and S106 requirements.

This page is intentionally left blank