

Committee Report

Item No: 4

Reference: DC/18/00723

Case Officer: Gemma Walker

Ward: Bacton and Old Newton

Ward Member: Jill Wilshaw

RECOMMENDATION – GRANT OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION WITH CONDITIONS

Description of Development

Outline planning application (access to be considered) - erection of up to 51 new homes, highway improvements including widening of Turkeyhall Lane, provision of public open space and associated infrastructure.

Location

Land to the east of Turkeyhall Lane and to the north of North Close, Bacton

Parish: Bacton

Expiry Date: 04/05/18

Application Type: Outline planning application

Development Type:

Applicant: Pigeon Investment Management Ltd

Agent: Beacon Planning Ltd

PART ONE – REASON FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE

The application is referred to committee for the following reason:

It is a 'Major' application for:

- a residential development for 15 or more dwellings.

Details of Previous Committee/Resolutions and Member Site Visit

None.

PART TWO – POLICIES AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Summary of Policies

Relevant policies in the Core Strategy Focused Review 2012 and Mid-Suffolk Local Plan 1998:

FC01 - Presumption In Favour of Sustainable Development

FC01_1 - Mid Suffolk Approach to Delivering Sustainable Development

FC02 - Provision and Distribution of Housing

CS01 - Settlement Hierarchy

CS02 - Development in the Countryside & Countryside Villages

CS03 - Reduce Contributions to Climate Change

CS04 - Adapting to Climate Change
CS05 - Mid Suffolk's Environment
CS06 - Services and Infrastructure
GP01 - Design and layout of development
HB01 - Protection of historic buildings
HB14 - Ensuring archaeological remains are not destroyed
H07 - Restricting housing development unrelated to needs of 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
H17 - Keeping residential development away from pollution
T09 - Parking Standards
T10 - Highway Considerations in Development
RT04 - Amenity open space and play areas within residential development
RT12 - Footpaths and bridleways
RT13 – Water based recreation
CL08 - Protecting wildlife habitats

Suffolk Design Guide
National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Supplementary Planning Documents

Suffolk Adopted Parking Standards (2015)

Consultations and Representations

During the course of the application consultation and representations from third parties have been received. These are summarised below.

A: Summary of Consultations

Bacton Parish Council

No objection. Bacton Parish Council wish to support this application on the condition that the specialists in Highways give particular consideration to planning policies T10 and T11 in understanding the proposed site is accessed from a preferred route for HGV's. Concern is for the safe provision of access to and from the site given the suitability of the existing road, and the turning of vehicles within the curtilage of the site and at the Turkey Hall Lane/Pound Hill junction. Consideration should also be taken to improving facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. Policy CS4 gives reference to flooding and drainage and the Council request this is also given careful consideration by an experienced specialist as this area is known to have flooding issues. Timing and development of infrastructure provision is a concern to the Council under policy CS6 and the Parish Council would like to be consulted over plans to deliver this.

SCC Highways Authority

We have reviewed the Transport Assessment and the data supplied with this application, the summary of our findings are as follows:

- The maximum 85%ile speed recorded on Turkey Hall Lane adjacent to the site is 26mph and the required visibility for the access on the highway can be met.
 - The total daily 2-way flow of traffic on Turkey Hall Lane is 186 vehicles and the additional vehicles from the development will not make the road and junctions over capacity.
 - The estimated total vehicle trips in the AM peak hour is 30 vehicles (average 1 vehicle every 2 minutes) which is acceptable in this location.
 - There are 2 slight injury accidents on Pound Lane; not near the site.
-

- The proposed carriageway widening and footway works improves access to village amenities for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians.

Taking all the above into account, it is our opinion that this development would not have a severe impact (NPPF para 32) therefore we do not object to the proposal subject to standard conditions.

BMSDC Heritage

The Heritage Team considers that the proposal would cause a low level of less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset because it would adversely impact the setting of a listed building.

The application is for outline planning permission for 51 new houses on agricultural land, as well as associated highways improvements, on land on the north side of Bacton. The heritage concern relates to the impact of the development on the setting of the Grade II Listed Turkey Hall, a c.17 house with paddock located adjacent to the proposal site to the northwest.

The development site would cover two fields on the edge of Bacton's existing settlement boundary. To the south of the development site is a c.20 housing development and a playing field. To the north west is Turkey Hall, which is currently surrounded on three sides by agricultural land. To its south west, across Turkeyhall Lane, are a few, detached dwellings with fields beyond.

Historic maps show that the setting of Turkey Hall was historically characterised by its isolated position within agricultural land. While the built-up boundary has moved relatively close to the building more recently, there is still enough separation for the building to be read as within agricultural land and distinct from the village. Recently, two bungalows have been built on the opposite side of Turkeyhall Lane, to the south west of the listed building, which do erode this character to a limited extent. Nonetheless, these buildings are set back in their plots, limited in massing and within an area surrounded by mature vegetation, so it is considered that they only have a limited impact upon the setting of Turkey Hall. Additionally, when considered as a group, Turkey Hall and these bungalows still feel somewhat isolated from the denser development to the south, due to the dense vegetation along this portion of the west side of Turkeyhall Lane.

In contrast, the land to the east, where the proposal site is, is much more open, so the proposed development would be much more dominant within the setting of Turkey Hall. Additionally, it would result in a significant parcel of land between the listed building and the c.20 development to the south becoming suburbanised. Therefore, the historic characteristic of isolation regarding Turkey Hall, still preserved to a large extent, would be severed, as the listed building would be read as within the context of the housing estate, rather than beyond one.

In conclusion, the application does not meet the requirements of s.66 of the P(LBCA)A 1990, nor the policies within the NPPF and the Local Plan. It is for these reasons that the Heritage Team does not support the proposal.

If the proposal were to be granted, the Heritage Team would recommend that any buildings located in the plots adjacent to Turkey Hall and/or its land were kept to one storey, reflecting the existing bungalows to the south west, to avoid them dominating the listed building and its land.

BMSDC Heritage – additional comments following amendment

Overall, the amendments would reduce the harm to the setting, and thus the significance of Turkey Hall. Nonetheless, there remains a low level of harm, as any proposal to develop this site, especially along Turkeyhall Lane, would reduce the isolated setting of Turkey hall and thus negatively impact its significance.

Suffolk Preservation Society

We have concerns regarding the impact of the proposals on the setting of Grade II listed Turkey Hall, a 17th century farmhouse located adjacent to the north west of the site.

We would suggest that a substantial landscape buffer area is incorporated into the site layout to protect the setting of Turkey Hall, by allowing the new dwellings to be sited away from this boundary, and enhanced planting be used to further screen the new development from this direction.

Additional comments following revised layout:

Many thanks for notifying SPS on the revisions to this application. We had raised concerns in our previous response regarding the impact of the development on the setting of the listed farmhouse. We therefore welcome that the amendments to layout which show the large detached dwelling nearest to the listed farmhouse has been removed. We also welcome the substantial amount of new tree planting which should help to screen the development from the heritage asset. This planting will also soften the transition from the village to its rural surrounding and retain a degree of separation between the village edge and Turkey Hall when travelling out of the village along the road.

Planting to the boundaries and within the development will also help to integrate the scheme into the countryside/ village edge. We would also like to see appropriate boundary treatment to the countryside edges - e.g post and rail fencing rather than close boarded fencing. In addition the fencing of the garden boundaries of plots 51 and 52 which run alongside the lane should also be carefully considered.

County Development Contributions Manager

Education:

Based on existing forecasts, SCC will have some limited surplus places available at the primary school for 10 pupils meaning that for the remaining 1 place required this will result in a future CIL funding bid of at least £12,181 (2017/18 costs). At the secondary school level SCC will have no surplus places available, for which a future CIL funding bid of at least £168,299 (2017/18 costs) will be made.

Early years:

From these development proposals SCC would anticipate up to 6 pre-school children arising, at a cost per place of £8,333.

Libraries:

A CIL contribution of £216 per dwelling is sought i.e. £11,016, which will be spent on enhancing provision at the nearest library

County Archaeological Service

This proposed development site lies in an area of archaeological potential as recorded by information held by the County Historic Environment Record (HER). The development is located to the east of, and in a similar topographic location to a Roman villa site and a prehistoric site including an enclosure and roundhouses (HER no. WYV 010). Although there are no recorded heritage assets within the proposed development site itself, this area has not been the subject of previous systematic investigation and recording. The scale of the site is such that it offers potential for the discovery of hitherto unknown important features and deposits. The proposed works would cause significant ground disturbance that has potential to damage any archaeological deposit and below ground heritage assets that exist. There are no grounds to consider refusal of permission in order to achieve preservation in situ of any important heritage assets. Two standard conditions recommended.

County Fire and Rescue Service

No objection – condition requiring fire hydrants to be installed.

Place Services - Ecology

No objection subject to standard ecological conditions.

Lead Flood Authority

No objection subject to standard conditions.

BMSDC Air Quality

No objection.

BMSDC Land Contamination

No objection.

BMSDC Waste

No objection subject to condition.

BMSDC Environmental Health-Noise/Odour/Light/Smoke

No objection subject to conditions.

BMSDC Housing Enabling Officer

No objection.

Open market homes: This proposal has submitted an indicative layout with 17 bungalows out of a total of 33 open market homes which equals 51% of the homes for sale on this site which is to be welcomed due to the aging population in Mid Suffolk and particularly in our rural villages.

Affordable houses: revised mix and sizes required.

BMSDC Arboricultural Officer

I have no objection to this application subject to it being undertaken in accordance with the protection measures outlined in the accompanying arboricultural report, an appropriate condition should be used for this purpose. Although a small number of trees are proposed for removal these are of limited amenity value and/or poor condition and their loss will have negligible impact upon the appearance and character of the local area.

NHS England

Provision of increased capacity within existing healthcare premises to be sought by CIL contributions. Funds likely to be used to reconfigure/extend Manor Farm Branch Surgery.

Environment Agency

No objection.

Anglian Water

No objection subject to foul water strategy condition.

B: Representations

Objections received on the following grounds (summarised):

Highway safety

Unsafe access

Construction traffic

Impact on the character of Turkey Hall Lane and Clay Lane

Heritage impacts on Turkey Hall

Noise and light pollution

Drainage and surface water run off issues

Excessive traffic generation

Flooding issues

PART THREE – ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION

1. The Site and Surroundings

- 1.1 The application site comprises (Grade 3) agricultural land to the north of Bacton, which is designated as a Key Service Centre in the Core Strategy. The site is located between residential properties to the west (Woodward Avenue) and south (North Close), and the Diss to Ipswich railway line to the east. The site fronts Turkey Hall Lane. To the east of the site is St Mary's Close Playground. The site abuts the village settlement boundary on its southern and western sides. To the north are arable fields.
- 1.2 In respect of heritage assets, at the north western corner of the site is Turkey Hall, a Grade II listed property and its associated outbuildings and land, which wrap around this corner of the site and front onto Turkey Hall Lane. This is the nearest listed building to the site, with others located some distance away in the central body of the village.
- 1.3 The site is not in or abutting a Conservation Area (there are no Conservation Areas in the village). The site is not in an area of special character designation such as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or Special Landscape Area. Nor is the site adjoining, or in proximity to, any designated landscape areas of special significance.
- 1.4 The site measures 3.52 ha (8.7 acres). The site is located in Flood Zone 1.
- 1.3 There is an existing field access to the site from Turkey Hall Lane. There are no Public Right of Ways that traverse or run close to the site.

2. The Proposal

- 2.1. The application seeks outline planning permission with all matters reserved except access for up to 51 dwellings.
- 2.2 An indicative layout has been provided to demonstrate how the site could develop if outline permission is granted. As noted in the supporting Planning Statement, the purpose of the indicative layout plan is simply to illustrate that the quantum of development, that being eight dwellings, can be accommodated at the site in an acceptable form. Key elements of the indicative layout are as follows:
 - Upgrade of the field access (to a new junction) on Turkey Hall Lane to serve the development.
 - Mix of detached and semi-detached dwellings at a density of 22 dwellings per hectare excluding the areas reserved as open space.
 - 35% affordable housing provision (18 dwellings).
 - Localised upgrade works to Turkey Hall Lane, widened to allow large vehicles to pass and incorporation of a footpath network.
 - Single and double storey dwellings envisaged.
 - Significant areas of public open space (totalling 1.2ha) comprising local play areas, public open spaces and green infrastructure.
 - Three attenuation ponds.
 - Pedestrian and cycling connectivity through North Close with an improved cycle/footpath to Pound Hill as well as via the existing recreation ground.
 - Retention and enhancement of all existing boundaries through new landscaping proposals.
 - Foul water pumping station.

3. The Principle of Development

- 3.1 The applicant engaged with Council officers prior to making the application. Pre-application officer advice was positive subject to detailed design matters. The applicant also engaged with the local community prior to application lodgement.
- 3.2 The Draft Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint SHLAA, May 2016, identifies the application site as SS0099. In respect to development suitability the Draft SHELAA states:

Site is potentially suitable, but the following constraints have been identified which would require further investigation:

Highways – regarding access, footpaths and infrastructure required

Heritage - Potential impact upon a Grade II listed building

Estimated dwelling yield: 50

- 3.3 The Council cannot currently demonstrate a five year housing supply. Paragraph 49 of the NPPF 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 housing supply. Where policies cannot be considered up-to-date, the NPPF (paragraph 14) cites the presumption in favour of sustainable development and states that planning permission should be granted unless i) any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole; or ii) specific policies in the NPPF indicate development should be restricted.
- 3.4 The NPPF requires that development be sustainable and that adverse impacts do not outweigh the benefits to be acceptable in principle. Paragraph 7 of the NPPF sets out three dimensions for sustainable development: economic, social and environmental.
- 3.5 The proposed scheme represents sustainable development, responding positively to the three dimensions, in accordance with the NPPF. The principle of developing the site for residential purposes is therefore acceptable. The following assessment outlines why this principle is accepted.

4. Economic, Social and Environmental Sustainable Development

- 4.1 Paragraph 55 of the NPPF seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas advising 'housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities', and recognises that where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby.
- 4.2 The site is located in the countryside, however, it lies adjacent the village settlement boundary. Bacton is a designated Key Service Centre, served by a very good range of local services and facilities, including a primary school, convenience store, medical centre, post office, village hall, public house, football club, church and mobile library service. Many of the amenities are within 800m of the site. Given the proximity of the site to these facilities, there is real opportunity that residents will walk and cycle to these facilities, particularly as pedestrian and cycle connections will be improved as part of the development.
- 4.3 The application is supported by a Transport Assessment (TA). The TA observes that the village benefits from good bus links to Stowmarket, Eye and Diss, with rail connections from Stowmarket to Ipswich, Cambridge and London on a regular basis. The site is within 400m of the bus stop on Station Road, within easy walking distance. Sustainable modes of transport are credible options for village residents and therefore of future occupants of the proposed development.

- 4.4 The site is a sustainable location for housing given the conveniently accessible facilities that the village provides. This conclusion is supported by the relevant assessment contained in the Draft SHELAA which concludes the site is suitable for residential development. It is noted the proposed lot yield is the same as the quantum suggested in the draft SHELAA (50 dwellings). As such the proposal has benefits with regards to the environmental strand of sustainable development.
- 4.5 The proposed development would add to the housing both in the village and in the district, which would be both a social and economic benefit, with the construction phase providing some benefits, and subsequent additional residents supporting existing services. As such the proposal provides both economic and social benefits.

5. Site Access, Parking and Highway Safety Considerations

- 5.1 Access is a matter sought for approval. Vehicular access to the site will be via an upgrade of the existing Turkey Hall Lane field access.
- 5.2 Paragraph 32 of the NPPF confirms that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe. This is interpreted as referring to matters of highway capacity and congestion, as opposed to matters of highway safety. The courts have held that paragraph 32 should not be interpreted to mean that anything other than a severe impact on highway safety would be acceptable (*Mayowa-Emmanuel v Royal Borough of Greenwich [2015] EWHC 4076 (Admin)*).
- 5.3 The Highway Authority raises no objection to the scheme on highway safety grounds. The local highway network can readily accommodate the anticipated increase in traffic generated by the proposed development. Visibility at the access will be SCC standard-compliant. The development offers significant highway improvements works, including making changes to the junction with Pound Hill to improve visibility in both directions, which will improve access to village amenities for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians, a positive planning outcome.
- 5.4 Parking provision for the 51 dwellings can be readily accommodated in a policy compliant manner.
- 5.5 There is no evidence before officers to suggest adverse highway safety outcomes will result. The proposal does not conflict with Policies T9, T10 or Paragraph 32 of the NPPF.

6. Design and Layout

- 6.1 Policy CS5 requires development to be of a high quality design that respects the local distinctiveness and the built heritage of Mid Suffolk, enhancing the character and appearance of the district.
- 6.2 Policy H13 of the Local Plan requires new housing development to be expected to achieve a high standard of design and layout and be of a scale and density appropriate to the site and its surroundings, whilst Policy H15 of the Local Plan similarly requires new housing to be consistent with the pattern and form of development in the area and its setting.
- 6.3 Policy GP1 of the Local Plan states that proposals comprising poor design and layout will be refused, requiring proposals to meet a number of design criteria including maintenance or enhancement of the surroundings and use of compatible materials.
- 6.4 Paragraph 56 of the NPPF attaches great importance to the design of the built environment, stating that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.
- 6.5 Design, layout and appearance are reserved matters. Notwithstanding, it is clear that these matters, whilst shown as indicative only, have been carefully considered by the applicant. The

applicant has demonstrated, to a high degree, how the proposal represents a site responsive design. Examples include the siting of wooded open space area at the northern end of the site to mitigate the impact on the setting of the Grade II listed Turkey Hall, utilising the existing access to limit highway safety impacts, and providing a low density of development (22 dwellings per hectare) consistent with neighbouring development. A low density development, offering significant landscaping opportunity, is welcomed.

- 6.6 A third of all dwellings are bungalows, a direct response to the pre-application engagement with the local community.

7. Landscape Impact, Trees, Ecology, Biodiversity and Protected Species

- 7.1 Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy seeks to protect and conserve landscape qualities taking into account the natural environment and the historical dimension of the landscape as a whole rather than concentrating solely on selected areas, protecting the District's most important components and encouraging development that is consistent with conserving its overall character.
- 7.2 Paragraph 109 of the NPPF states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils.
- 7.3 The site is not in an area of special character designation such as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or Special Landscape Area. Nor is the site adjoining, or in proximity to, any designated landscape areas of special significance.
- 7.4 The application site is visually well contained owing to existing boundary planting, the existence of the road to the western boundary and the body of the village to the south. The site is well related to the village given it abuts the village's settlement boundary and will therefore not appear as an isolated development in the countryside, noting the suburban appearance of the western side of Turkey Hall Lane opposite the site. The development will define a new edge to the village body, not a planning outcome that is considered fatal to the application. Harm in a landscape sense will be relatively limited provided a comprehensive landscaping theme is incorporated. A comprehensive landscape plan, including a detailed boundary treatment plan, will be required to ensure the rural landscape character is maintained and enhanced. This is most appropriately managed through the (landscaping) reserved matters stage of the development process.
- 7.6 Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy requires development to protect, manage and enhance Mid Suffolk's biodiversity.
- 7.7 Regulation 9(5) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (Implemented 1st April 2010) requires all 'competent authorities' (public bodies) to 'have regard to the Habitats Directive in the exercise of its functions.' For a Local Planning Authority to comply with regulation 9(5) it must 'engage' with the provisions of the Habitats Directive.
- 7.8 Paragraph 118 of the NPPF requires planning authorities, when determining planning applications, to seek the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity by ensuring significant harm resulting from a development is avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), or where not possible to be adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, and if this cannot be secured then planning permission should be refused.
- 7.9 An Ecology Report supports the application. Place Services (Ecology) raise no objection and suggested conditions are supported by officers. The proposal responds favourably to Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy and Policy CL8 of the Local Plan.

- 7.10 The application is supported by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment which has been reviewed by Council's Arboricultural Officer. The Arboricultural Officer does not raise an objection. There will be no loss of significant trees and significant landscape planting will offer enhanced local arboricultural values.

8. Land Contamination

- 8.1 The application is supported by the necessary contamination assessment. Environmental Health do not raise an objection to the scheme.

9. Heritage Issues

- 9.1 Policy HB1 of the Local Plan seeks to protect the character and appearance of buildings of architectural or historic interest, particularly protecting the settings of Listed Buildings.
- 9.2 Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Listed Building or its setting.
- 9.3 Where policies are out of date, paragraph 14 of the NPPF says that permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole; or specific policies indicate development should be restricted. In this case there are specific NPPF policies relating to designated heritage assets that should be considered.
- 9.4 Paragraph 129 of the NPPF identifies that the impact of a proposal on the significance of a heritage asset should be taken into account, in order to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.
- 9.5 Paragraph 134 of the NPPF states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
- 9.6 Council's Heritage Team consider the development will cause a 'low level of less than substantial harm' to the setting of the Grade II listed Turkey Hall. The team is concerned that the immediate land around the hall will become suburbanised and this will undermine the historic characteristic of isolation regarding the hall, as the listed building would be read as within the context of the housing estate, rather than beyond one. The layout proposed is indicative and over the course of the application amended by the applicants to demonstrate the separation that can still be offered to Turkey Hall.
- 9.7 The setting of Turkey Hall will change, this is not in dispute. The applicant has designed the indicative layout in a manner that seeks to mitigate the impact on the rural setting of Turkey Hall. In particular, the proposed expanse of wooded open space has been set adjacent the listed property. This landscaped buffer will maintain a rural setting, albeit a setting that will no longer comprise an open, rural field. A landscaped setting is not considered unacceptable as it will retain, to some degree, the prevailing rural character. The hall will continue, to some extent, to read as an isolated property on the periphery of Bacton village. Moreover, it is noted that the western side of Turkey Hall Lane has already been developed up to Turkey Hall and development on the eastern side of the lane is clearly visible from around the Hall in views south across the intervening field which forms part of the application site.
- 9.8 As noted earlier in the report, the site is not in or abut a Conservation Area and there are no Conservation Areas in the village.

10. Impact on Residential Amenity

- 10.1 Policy H13 of the Local Plan seeks to ensure new housing development protects the amenity of neighbouring residents. Policy H16 of the Local Plan seeks to protect the existing amenity of residential areas.
- 10.2 Paragraph 17 of the NPPF sets out a number of core planning principles as to underpin decision-taking, including, seeking to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.
- 10.3 The indicative layout demonstrates the site is readily capable of accommodating 51 dwellings in a manner that will not result in detriment to the residential amenity of future occupiers of the development or occupiers of neighbouring dwellings. The proximity to the rail line is noted, however given the separation distance between the proposed dwellings and the line, it is not considered necessary that noise insulating construction methods are warranted. Amenity standards will be carefully scrutinised at the reserved matters stage of the approvals process.
- 10.4 It is to be noted that the proposed scheme has not attracted any objections on residential amenity grounds, such as overlooking, loss of sunlight/daylight or visual bulk effects. This is perhaps indicative of a design approach that has been carefully considered, taking account of neighbouring amenity expectations.
- 10.5 Internal amenity for future occupants will be of a sufficient standard, with all dwellings provided reasonable levels of private open space and appropriate aspect/outlook. Solar and daylight access levels are adequate, and whilst there will be a level of intervisibility between properties, appropriate privacy is afforded to each plot. Separation distances between dwellings and carefully sited garages ensures any visual bulk effects will be minimised, safeguarding future occupants' amenity.
- 10.6 Construction hours can be managed by planning condition, as recommended by Council's Environmental Health Officer, to ensure the construction phase of development is carried out in a manner that safeguards neighbouring residents' amenity.
- 10.7 The proposal accords with the aspirations of local Policies H13 and H16 and paragraph 17 of the NPPF.

11. Flooding and Drainage

- 11.1 Objectors raise concerns regarding surface water run-off and flood risk. The site is located in Flood Zone 1. The application is supported by a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA confirms that there is a localised risk of surface water flooding along the drainage ditch which crosses the site and along the ditch on the western boundary. The indicative site layout accommodates this surface water flooding with buildings located outside the surface water flood zone and that affected properties will have finished floor levels at least 150mm above ground level.
- 11.2 The Lead Flood Authority has reviewed the submitted FRA and does not raise objection subject to standard conditions. In the absence of an objection from the Lead Flood Authority a reason for refusal on flood grounds cannot be sustained.
- 11.3 An adoptable pumping station has been included within the indicative layout to address concerns raised by Anglia Water regarding foul water management. Anglian Water's suggested condition is agreed.

PART FOUR – CONCLUSION

12. Planning Balance and Conclusion

- 12.1 Council cannot demonstrate a five year housing supply. Local policies relating to the supply of housing, including Policy CS2, CS11 and CS15, must be considered not up-to-date in accordance with the NPPF.
- 12.2 Where policies cannot be considered up-to-date, the NPPF (paragraph 14) cites the presumption in favour of sustainable development and states that planning permission should be granted unless i) any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole; or ii) specific policies in the NPPF indicate development should be restricted.
- 12.3 Officers conclude that specific policies do not indicate development should be restricted. Therefore, the proposal should proceed to be determined in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development – the ‘tilted balance’ approach.
- 12.4 The NPPF advises that the environmental aspect of sustainability includes contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; economic and social gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously with environmental improvement.
- 12.5 The economic and social gains will be significant, the most notable being the boost to the housing supply and increase in much needed affordable housing stock (required revisions to the affordable mix can be secured through the s106 process). Other gains include improved traffic conditions and enhanced pedestrian and cyclist connectivity to the village (to be secured through a s278 Agreement), and recreational benefits through public open space provision, including new play space. Environmental benefits include biodiversity enhancements and landscaping providing screening and visual amenity benefits.
- 12.6 The site is a sustainable location on the edge of a key service centre. The proposed development is physically well related to the village, set adjacent the settlement boundary. Visual intrusion into the countryside will be limited given the development is set against the backdrop of the body of the village. The development will not be isolated in a visual or social sense. Landscape harm will be less than moderate. There will be harm to the setting of the Grade II listed Turkey Hall however this harm is limited and mitigated through the incorporation of a landscaped buffer and is outweighed by the significant economic, social and environmental gains identified above.
- 12.7 Highway safety outcomes are appropriately safeguarded, with the Highways Authority raising no objection. Residential amenity levels for neighbouring residents can be maintained. Amenity for future occupants will be to an acceptable standard.
- 12.8 Archaeology, ecology, tree impacts, sustainable construction methods and contamination are all matters that can be adequately managed by planning condition.
- 12.9 The proposal represents a site responsive design. The Parish Council is in support of the proposed scheme. The application is well supported by a comprehensive package of specialist reports that demonstrate how the development has been crafted in a manner that responds positively to all site constraints.
- 12.10 There are no compelling reasons to withhold the grant of outline planning permission for up to 51 dwellings. The proposal constitutes sustainable development for which the NPPF carries a presumption in favour and therefore the outline application is recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION

- (1) Subject to the prior agreement of a Section 106 Planning Obligation on appropriate terms to the satisfaction of the Corporate Manager – Planning for Growth to secure:
 - Affordable Housing
 - Provision, management and maintenance of public open space
 - Offsite highway works.

- (2) That the Corporate Manager – Planning for Growth be authorised to grant Outline Planning Permission subject to conditions including:
 - Standard Time Limit Condition
 - Reserved Matters to be submitted and agreed
 - Approved Plans
 - As recommend by Highways
 - As recommended by Environmental Health
 - Surface water drainage scheme to be agreed and fully implemented as approved
 - Sustainable Urban Drainage System
 - Construction surface water management plan detailing surface water and storm water
 - Foul water strategy Anglian Water
 - Sustainability efficiency measures
 - Archaeological work and monitoring
 - Details of fire hydrants to be submitted
 - The recommendations of the ecological report to be adhered to
 - Construction management plan including hours of construction
 - Detailed hard/soft and boundary landscaping to be submitted with reserved matters
 - Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement compliance
 - Implementation of landscaping scheme
 - Unexpected contamination
 - Secure mitigation and ecology enhancement measures
 - Lighting scheme – biodiversity
 - Waste vehicle manoeuvring
 - Withdrawal PD rights

- (3) That in the event of the Planning obligations referred to in Resolution (1) above not being secured that the Corporate Manager – Planning for Growth be authorised to refuse planning permission on appropriate grounds.