

Public Document Pack



PLANNING COMMITTEE	
DATE:	WEDNESDAY, 15 JUNE 2022 9.30 AM
VENUE:	FRINK ROOM (ELISABETH) - ENDEAVOUR HOUSE

For consideration at the meeting on Wednesday, 15 JUNE 2022, the following additional or updated papers that were unavailable when the Agenda was printed.

TABLED PAPERS

	<u>Page(s)</u>
a DC/19/00567 LAND NORTH OF, BURSTALL LANE, 3 - 10 SPROUGHTON, IPSWICH, IP8 3DE	

For more information about this meeting, including access arrangements and facilities for people with disabilities, please contact the Committee Officer, Committee Services on: 01473 296376 or Email: Committees@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 6a

Tabled Papers

DC/19/00567- Land to east of Loraine Way (Bramford Road), Sprooughton

Hybrid Application comprising:

Outline Planning Application (Access to be considered) for the erection of up to 92 homes and 13 self-build/custom build plots (including provision of up to 37 affordable homes); open space, including a village wood; land for community use/ local shops/ office space; land for a village car park; land for an extension to existing village allotments; land for paddocks; land for relocated and enhanced caravan storage provision; safeguarded land for potential future relief road; new public right of way and associated infrastructure provision.

Full planning application for spine road between Loraine Way and Burstall Lane (including accesses onto Burstall Lane and Loraine Way); access for proposed caravan storage area; accesses for self-build plots from Burstall Lane; and associated drainage and highway works (including formation of passing bays on Burstall Lane)

Updates to Main Committee Report

References to the Joint Local Plan in the original committee report (Appendix 1) refer to the Joint Local Plan Preferred Options Regulation 18 document published in July 2019. The more recent Joint Local Plan Pre-submission Regulation 19 document published November 2020 provides a revised emerging site allocation description and site extent. For the avoidance of doubt, the emerging site allocation wording is provided below and the extent of the emerging site allocation will be shown in the committee presentation. This is identical to the proposed number of dwellings and site boundaries for this planning application.

LA012 – Allocation: Land north of Burstall Lane and west of B1113, Sprooughton

Site Size – 10.6ha

Approximately 105 dwellings (and associated infrastructure)

The development shall be expected to comply with the following:

I. The relevant policies set out in the Plan;

II. Landscaping to reflect the sensitivity of the landscape the area;

III. Development is designed to conserve and where appropriate enhance The Wild Man public house, 2 and 4 Lower Street (all Grade II listed) and their settings;

IV. An archaeological assessment and measures for managing impacts on archaeological remains is provided;

V. An ecological survey, and any necessary mitigation measures are provided;

VI. Allotments are retained in their current location or an alternative provision of equal or greater quality, accessibility and quantity of allotments space is provided as part of the scheme;

VII. Rights of Way should be retained and enhanced to enable access to the countryside and active transport;

VIII. Contributions to the satisfaction of the LPA, towards pre-school and primary school and secondary school provision;

- IX. Contributions to the satisfaction of the LPA, towards healthcare provision;*
- X. Contributions to the satisfaction of the LPA, towards additional Household Waste Recycling provision;*
- XI. Contributions to the satisfaction of the LPA, for improving local pedestrian links;*
- XII. Contributions to the satisfaction of the LPA, towards junction improvements on the A1071; and*
- XIII. A full assessment of increased discharge on the watercourse, and relevant mitigation measures.*

Members are reminded however that as set out in paragraph 2.3 of the Main Committee Report (the report being presented to Members at committee on 15th June 2022), no determinative weight is placed on the inclusion of this site in the JLP, and the emerging plan at present has limited weight as a material consideration.

Further information received from Ward Member

Two emails (Appendix A and Appendix I) and the following documents have been received from Cllr Zac Norman:

- Traffic Surveys – a survey of speed and volume of vehicles taken in May 2022 on Burstall Lane, Loraine Way, High Street and Lower Street (Appendix B to E)

Officer response: SCC Highway Authority have reviewed the further traffic surveys in relation to this planning application and they do not affect the previous highways advice given (dated 11th September 2020 as detailed in the Main Committee Report). Safe access and egress from the site will be provided in terms of the visibility splays and vehicle speeds. In terms of traffic volumes recorded in May 2022 on Loraine Way these are very similar to those in the submitted Transport Assessment to support the planning application.

- Sproughton Housing Needs Assessment by Aecom (October 2020) (Appendix F)

Officer response: The contents of this document are noted but are considered to be superseded by the findings of the appeal on the Hopkins Homes site, as set out in paragraphs 2.7 to 2.9 of the Main Committee Report. The Aecom housing needs assessment was for a parish/neighbourhood plan area-wide, which would include those areas within the Ipswich Fringe. The outcomes of the Hopkins Homes appeal was to consider the village-only need in accordance with current policy CS11 of Babergh Core Strategy, which is also the approach required to be taken on this application. This does not change the position reported to Members in terms of the proposed development being far in excess of the established local housing need of 25 dwellings.

- Sproughton Neighbourhood Plan – Site Options and Assessment Final Report (May 2021) (Appendix G)

Officer response: The report sets out an assessment of potential sites for the inclusion in Sproughton Neighbourhood Plan. This document is part of the evidence base for the neighbourhood plan, but as at present that plan has limited weight (as set out in paragraph 2.4 of the Main Committee Report) this does not alter the advice or the recommendation presented to Members in the Main Committee Report. This report does identify this application site and grades it as ‘amber’ potential for development, which is defined as

“...indicates the site is less sustainable or may be appropriate for development if certain issues can be resolved or constraints mitigated.” An extract of the site assessment is shown below:

SS0223	Land north of Burstall Lane and West of B1113, Sproughton	Suitability: Site is potentially suitable, but the following considerations would require further investigation: Highways – regarding access, footpaths and infrastructure required. Heritage-potential impact upon heritage assets. Allotment - relocation. Minerals - site lies within Mineral Safeguarding Zone. Availability: Submission has proposed 0-5 years deliverability. No attempts at marketing have	3.3	105	Residential	
						The site is potentially suitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to the constraints noted in the SHELAA being addressed. The site is potentially in conformity with Core Strategy CS11, as the site is adjacent to the adopted settlement boundary. Development of the site would constitute a large extension to the north of Sproughton and would significantly change the character and setting of the village. The site is very visible from many points in the village, has long ranging views and the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment (2020)

25

Sproughton Neighbourhood Plan

DRAFT

Site Reference	Address/location	BMSJLP Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) Conclusions	Gross Site Area (Ha)	Capacity (Indicative number of homes)	Land Use being considered	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment: Overall site rating (Red/ Amber/ Green)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment: Justification
		been undertaken. Site is under single ownership. Achievability: The submission confirms that the site could come forward in 0-5 years. The submission confirms that there are no known legal restrictions on the land and no known abnormal costs which would affect viability. The submission estimates the likely build out rate at 35 - 40 units per annum. Summary: The site is potentially considered suitable for residential development, taking identified constraints into consideration.				stated the site had moderate sensitivity to residential development. However, Landscape and Visual Assessment submitted as part of the pending planning application states that this could be overcome with appropriate planting and green infrastructure. It does, however, note that the site would be visible in the local context. The Sproughton Neighbourhood Plan Landscape Appraisal notes that substantial planting would be required, which should aim to replicate the character of the wooded slopes south of Burstall Lane. In addition, the site would be visible on approach to the village from the north and west which would require careful design to reinforce a positive arrival into the village. Therefore, landscape impacts would need to be mitigated as well as the constraints identified in the SHELAA; namely, highways and heritage.	

Figure 1: Extract from Sproughton Neighbourhood Plan – Site Options and Assessment Final Report (May 2021)

Further information received from Ward Member (cont'd)

- Appeal decision on Land East of Bramford Road (Hopkins Homes Site) (Appendix H)

Officer response: This appeal decision has been considered in the Main Committee Report in relation to local housing need (paragraphs 2.5 to 2.9). The appeal is not considered to have any other implications to the recommendation made in the Conclusions to the Main Committee Report.

- Sproughton Neighbourhood Plan Landscape Appraisal (February 2021) (Appendix J)

Officer response: This report identifies the landscape sensitivities outlined in the Original Committee Report (Appendix 1 to Main Committee Report), including its position in the Gipping River Valley (Special Landscape Area) and views across the site from public rights of way to the west of the application site. The contents of this report are noted but are not considered to change the landscape impacts reported in the Conclusion to the Main Committee Report.

Further letter of representations

Sproughton Parish Council received 12th June 2022 (Appendix K) – letter of objection which is summarised below:

- Contrary to Babergh Core Strategy policies CS2 – Settlement Pattern Policy - local housing need is already met by existing consents and the current core strategy protects the village of Sproughton as a Hinterland Village even though the parish includes the urban edge of Ipswich.
- The Sproughton Neighbourhood Plan – Site Options and Assessment Final Report (May 2021) identifies the site as unsustainable.
- Does not meet requirements of CS11 – Strategy for Development of Core and Hinterland Villages – does not meet the different criteria of being well design and appropriate in size/scale, layout and character to its setting and to the village, is not well related to the existing pattern of development, does not meet a proven local need, no further employment needed considering the Sugar Beet size employment provision in the parish.
- Does not meet requirements of CS15 – concern over landscape impact, impact on character, shape and scale of the area (relating to self-build plots in particular), no need for further employment and highway safety compromised.
- Does not meet requirements of CN04 – Special Landscape Areas – proposed does not maintain or enhance the special landscape qualities of the area, the site is old hunting pasture connected with the Grade II listed Grindle Farm and would be the only development on the west side of the valley.

Officer response: The concerns and objections are noted. On local housing need the position is set out as above in the response to Cllr Zac Norman's further representations. The Site Options and Assessment report by Aecom identifies the site as 'Amber' but does not conclude the site is unsustainable, but that it is potentially suitable for development if the different identified constraints are taken into consideration (Figure 1 above). The assessment for CS11, CS15 and CN04 remains as detailed in the Original Committee Report, with the updated position on local housing need identified in the Main Committee Report. Officer's recommendations remain the same.

Sproughton Parish Council received 14th June 2022 (Appendix O) – email of Clarification of Various Points from Public Report Pack

- Email received clarifying points as follows in the Main Committee Report. Also attached were Sproughton Housing Survey Report by Community Action Suffolk dated July 2019 (Appendix P) and a "Housing Needs Survey – trends" document (Appendix Q)
- Raise concern over reason for referral back to committee and status of the JLP. Also identified that SPC raised legal matters with Babergh as they became aware of a High Court decision that they considered relevant to the application of The R (KIDES) v South Cambridgeshire District Council High Court Decision (c 2002) established

the position that if there is a material change in an application before the approval/decision notice the council is required to review the application. Given the time between committee and the potential issue of an approval and postponement of the JLP considered it needed to go back to committee.

Officer response: Noted.

- Neighbourhood Plan– work is progressing but are awaiting further input from Babergh District Council. Note the majority of work done and they do not anticipate major changes. It does not contain allocation and were obliged to accept the Pigeon site as in the JLP. Consider that given the status of the JLP the settlement boundary reverts to the original one.

Officer response: The proposed settlement boundary of the emerging neighbourhood plan is as published, Any changes would need to go through due process, but in any event the plan has limited weight at this time for the reasons set out in the officers report.

- Consider the different level of harm identified by the Inspector for the Hopkins Homes site should be identified and is relevant and queries the impact on heritage assets.

Officer response: The heritage harm in the Hopkins Homes appeal identified by the Inspector was a high level of less than substantial harm. However each application must be assessed on its own merits, as set out in the Main Committee Report. The comments do not change officers advice in relation to heritage impact or level of harm for this application.

- Housing need – note comments and also point out work has begun on 14 houses on Hadleigh Road and permission granted for dwellings at Geest House, Hadleigh.

Officer response: The housing need remains as presented in the committee report, there have been no further consents issued in the parish since October 2020 that would impact on local housing need, but in any case officers have noted the conflict with CS11 in this regard.

- No pedestrian connectivity to site across B1113.

Officer response: A zebra crossing is proposed and secured as part of the highway mitigation for the scheme.

- Benefits – No guarantee that benefits will be delivered for the community in S106 – consider woodland should be transferred to Sproughton PC, the village car park built by the developer and transferred to the PC with a maintenance fund and the community buildings should be built in agreement with and transferred to the PC.

Officer response: The S106 secured the public benefits but officers cannot insist on who the management body would be moving forward for these uses. The option for the parish to manage these areas is within the S106 although a commuted sum for the car park maintenance has not been secured and in the absence of a policy requiring any maintenance fee officers were not able to secure one. Again in the absence of a policy requiring a community building officers could not secure the construction of the building, only the provision of land and an agreed marketing strategy to market the site.

- Further development – paragraph 12.15 of the committee report appears to refer to the potential for further development.

Officer response: This paragraph only refers to a justification for recommending this application for approval, the requirement to boost the supply of housing under para 74 of the

NPPF. This does not support or suggest further development at this site would be suitable to that proposed under this application.

- Why can't skylark mitigation be to the west of the site

Officer response: Suitable habitat needs to be provided, and the plans showing the locations within the agreed S106 have been considered suitable by the council's Ecologist.

Dr and Mrs Brown, Grindle Farm, The Grindle received 9th June 2022 (Appendix L and Appendix M) – letter of objection received via Sproughton Neighbourhood Plan Group which is summarised below:

- As a previous Chair of the Ipswich and East Suffolk Clinical Commissioning Group (around 2005) no new development was taking place in south-west Ipswich, but the CCG were able to secure a site on Ravenswood and a site in north-east Ipswich. And a site is being secured at the Took's Bakery site. Fail to understand how the CCG comments fits with its previous policy. Do not consider that there is the ability to expand the surgeries identified.
- No reference to Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding being secured from this application to date.
- Advise that it would be a major error to take the advice of the CCG, that the council has been badly advised on this point and there should be no further development to the south west of Ipswich until this issue has been resolved.
- Also wished to point out that although the heritage listing refers to the heritage asset as Grindle House it is called Grindle Farm.

Officer response: Note the concerns raised, but in the absence of an objection from the CCG officers have no option but to advise that there is a strategy in place to provide for healthcare needs by the NHS/CCG. The CIL funding referred to would be collected on commencement of any development/phase of and so the council would not be in receipt of it at this stage in the application process.

Lobbying material from applicants

A Member Briefing Note (Appendix N) was sent to Members of Planning Committee by Pigeon Investment Management outlining the history of the application, the benefits of the scheme and suggested amendments to the agreed Section 106 agreement and proposed benefits of the scheme. The agreed S106 is also appended to this briefing note. The matters raised are summarised as follows with the Officer's response:

- Amendments to the agreed S106 to ensure Sproughton Parish Council manage the allotments and jointly manage the community woodland with the Felix Thornley Cobbold Agricultural Trust (FTCAT)

Officer response: The option is present in the agreed S106 for the parish council to be transferred or leased the allotment extension and to be the nominated body to manage the community woodland. Revised wording to the S106 agreement would need to be reviewed by officers to fully understand this offer further. It does not change the delivery of these public benefits which is already secured in the agreed S106, but may meet the aspirations of the parish council for future management of these areas (this has not been confirmed either way by the parish council given the late submission of this information).

- Increase the biodiversity net gain achieved on site in excess of 10% and management of ecological areas shared between Sroughton Parish Council and FTCAT.

Officer response: Officers would need to see detailed proposals and assess those with the council's Ecologist to be able to ensure this could be delivered. Details of management and how that would be shared with the parish council would also need to be submitted. These details are not before Members today and committee can only make its resolution on the proposals as presented in the committee report. This does not change any aspect of officer's recommendation.

- Construction of community use/local shops/office space progressed by Sroughton Parish Council and FTCAT, to a specification agreed in full collaboration to ensure the delivery of these uses.
- Construction of proposed village car park progressed by Sroughton Parish Council and FTCAT to a specification agreed in full collaboration to ensure its delivery.

Officer response: In response to both of these above points officers would need to see any revised wording of the S106 to see whether it would change the benefits associated with this proposal. It has not been possible to ensure the community use/local shops/office space building is actually built by the applicants which as reported in the original committee report tempers this benefit to a degree. The village car park is required to be delivered by occupation of the 50th dwelling in the agreed S106 agreement, and so this would not change the delivery of this public benefits, but may meet the aspirations of the parish council for future management of these areas (this has not been confirmed either way by the parish council given the late submission of this information).

Further points made also include:

- The site's proposed allocation in the Sroughton Neighbourhood Plan should attract some positive weight in the planning balance given that no objections were made in response to the Regulation 14 consultation on that plan.

Officer response: The site is included by extension to the proposed settlement boundary. There are a number of comments to the Regulation 14 Pre-Submission consultation document outlining concerns over development to the north of the village and further development in general. Officer's view remains the same that limited weight can be given to this plan given its early stage in preparation.

- The Inspector for the Hopkins Homes appeal (land east of Bramford Road/Lorraine Way for 49 dwellings) concluded that the conflict of not being able to demonstrate a local housing need would be very minor.

Officer response: For completeness here is the relevant paragraph from the appeal decision:

40. Any harm therefore arising from this proposal not meeting a demonstrated local need would be very minor in this instance given that I am satisfied that the appeal site is well related to a HV which is in a very accessible location for development in accordance with paragraphs 8b and part 9 of the Framework. Therefore, for the reasons above, the weight given to the conflict with Policies CS2 and CS11 is very minor.

Each application does need to be considered on its individual merits as each proposal and how it interacts with relevant policies is different. The proposed number of dwellings in this

appealed application was lower and the level of conflict with local housing need different. The conclusion on the accessible location is reflected in the officer's recommendation for this site, but it is important each application is considered on its own merits. This does not alter the recommendations made in the Main Committee Report to Members.

- Improvements to sustainability credential of development. A number of measures are outlined that could be included/be secured for the proposed development including Passivhaus design principles, a reduction in carbon emissions by 50% and a number of other design specifications.

Officer response: Any revised proposals would need to be submitted to the council for due consideration, and if necessary public consultation. How any such benefits would be secured would also need to be carefully considered by officers. Members are advised to consider the proposal before them presented in the Main Committee Report only.