

Committee Report

Item No: 2

Reference: DC/18/03111

Case Officer: Mark Russell

Ward: Stowmarket North/ Onehouse/ Haughley and Wetherden

Ward Member: Cllr Barry Humphreys MBE, Cllr Dave Muller, Cllr Gary Green, Cllr John Matthissen, Cllr Rachel Eburne.

RECOMMENDATION – GRANT RESERVED MATTERS PLANNING PERMISSION WITH CONDITIONS

Description of Development

Submission of Details (First) under Outline Planning Permission 5007/16 for Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for 175 dwellings, including affordable housing, associated hard and soft landscaping and infrastructure, foul water pumping station, provision of new electricity sub-station and inclusion of layby parking for 12 spaces adjacent to the school site.

Location: Land North Of Chilton Leys, Brooke Way, Stowmarket IP14 1UH

Parish: Onehouse

Expiry Date: 26/09/18

Application Type: Reserved Matters planning application

Development Type: Major Small Scale - Dwellings

Applicant: Andrew Garnham, Taylor Wimpey East Anglia

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

Outline permission 5007/16 was granted permission in April 2017.

Full permission 5005/16 was granted for highway and utilities infrastructure.

PART TWO – POLICIES AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Summary of Policies

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

CS01 - Settlement Hierarchy
CS03 - Reduce Contributions to Climate Change
CS04 - Adapting to Climate Change
CS05 - Mid Suffolk's Environment
CS06 - Services and Infrastructure
CS09 - Density and Mix
CL 11 - Retaining high quality agricultural land
FC03 - Supply Of Employment Land
FC01 - Presumption In Favour Of Sustainable Development
FC01_1 - Mid Suffolk Approach To Delivering Sustainable Development
SMP - Stowmarket Area Action Plan
GP01 - Design and layout of development
H 13 - Design and layout of housing development
H 15 - Development to reflect local characteristics
H 16 - Protecting existing residential amenity
T1 0 - Highway Considerations in Development
FC02 - Provision and Distribution of Housing
H07 - Restricting housing development unrelated to needs of countryside
H14 - A range of house types to meet different accommodation needs
H17 - Keeping residential development away from pollution
T09 - Parking Standards
RT04 - Amenity open space and play areas within residential development
RT12 - Footpaths and bridleways
RT13 – Water based recreation
CL08 - Protecting wildlife habitats

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Supplementary Planning Documents

SCC 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

Onehouse Parish Council

Councillors support the application with the following conditions:

That landscaping is in place by the end of 2018 to allow trees to establish prior to commencement of building work to reduce the visual impact. Landscaping continues from the top of phase 2 to the proposed bus gateway

phase 1 should be completed before work commences on phase 2.

The quantity of affordable housing does not meet the 35% required for a development of this size.

(Officer note – This is reserved matters, phasing and affordable housing are dealt with under the Outline Application and Section 106 agreement.)

Stowmarket Town Council

That no objection be raised to the grant of planning consent, however, the Town Council would like to make comment in respect of the following:

- i) That adequate early landscaping treatment is carried out with regard to the Pauper's Graves; (Officer note: This would be in respect of later phases and not included with this reserved matters submission)
- ii) That the planned footpaths and cycle paths are of a good standard in order to prevent conflict between pedestrians and cyclists;
- iii) That the garages planned as part of this development will only be used for the parking of vehicles;
- iv) That the electric car charging ports will be attached to the back wall of the garages; and
- v) That a landscape Management Plan is drawn up to prevent a burden being placed upon Mid Suffolk District Council with regard to public open spaces and the play area. (Officer note: Adoption and management of these areas is dealt with under the Outline permission and 106 agreement)

The Town Council would like to express disappointment that no details have been forthcoming with respect to the planned school and would wish to see plans coming forward in the near future in order that undue pressure is not placed upon the town's existing schools as a result of this phase of development.

(Officer note: The school was part of the hybrid application (regarded as phase 1) and is subject to a specific trigger point that is part of the first 215 dwellings of said phase and when SCC requires the school. The trigger points are set or otherwise at the control of the SCC in this regard and not the applicant.

Highways England

No objection.

SCC Highway Authority

The Highway Authority's original comments comprised several points of concern – including Insufficient verge-width for the proposed tree planting, vehicular access to plots 1-5 (off Phase 1b) being unsafe, minimum centreline radius of Road 14 needing to be increased, the pinch point on the footpath south of the community orchard needing to be widened, the location of the Zebra Crossing requiring a re-think, the visibility splays at Plot 37 not being workable and access to the 'convenience store' off the spine road (as only 30m from Road 11) not being acceptable.

In addition, the HA raised concern over the amount of proposed tandem parking and also proposed improved traffic calming and linking the cycle path and the cul-de-sac near plot 60 as well as improving other footways.

At the time of writing, the HA had discussed these matters with the applicant and amended drawings. A meeting was held on 27th September between the developer, the HA and your officer and the points raised by the HA were discussed.

Most points were resolved as per the HA's request – with amendments and clarifications concerning the points raised and a new set of drawings submitted in early October.

BMSDC Heritage

The dwelling types are a pastiche of traditional domestic architecture, but in most cases their forms are not unacceptable. However, on drawing ref.no. 20824/SS there are several dwellings (including plots 18, 112, 115, 171, 172, though there may be more) which appear to feature brick facades and, inexplicably, rendered gables over a pentice board above first floor. This is contrived and despite, no doubt, an occasional example in the county of a similar detail that one may be able to point to, it cannot be argued to reinforce local distinctiveness - and as such the Heritage Team does not support the detail. Far more appropriate would be the use of brick cladding over the entire structures.

On residential properties, the use of a Marley fibre plank cladding might briefly reference low status, later C18th and earlier C19th timber framed and clad cottages, of which the district has various examples. However, in this situation, it appears entirely at odds with the general scale and architectural language proposed in the development. Unfortunately, it is reflective of the identikit palette of materials used by developers across the country. It diminishes the local distinctiveness of the place generally and reinforces a bland, insipid architecture, instead of being innovative or locally distinct. The Heritage Team does not support its use.

The remainder of the materials and details supplied are not unacceptable.

NOTE - amendments have been received.

Suffolk Wildlife Trust

20th August 2018: We note the proposed ecological enhancements (drawing no. CSA/2833/165 Rev A) and are pleased to see that these include measures for bats, swifts, house sparrows and hedgehogs, as well as landscaping planting which could benefit a wider suite of species. We would however recommend that swift boxes are installed in greater numbers than the 5 proposed (for example 2 or 3 boxes per dwelling). Also, the buildings proposed for single hole house sparrow boxes could instead be fitted with swift boxes to increase the number of such boxes available.

With regard to the proposed hedgehog holes, again we support the inclusion of these but query why they are not present for all gardens?

26th September 2018: Thank you for the e-mail and the updated ecological enhancement information, I can confirm that these satisfy the comments made in our letter of 13th August 2018 and we have no further comments to make on this application.

Natural England

No comments.

County Development Contributions Manager

No comments, other than the proviso that the terms of the existing s.106 remain in place.

County Archaeological Service

All the on-site archaeological work for the area covered by this first RM application has now been completed, however, the post excavation analysis and reporting work for this area is still outstanding.

This is covered by condition 6 of application 5007/16 so I assume that you do not need to also apply our second part condition to the RM application in order to secure this work? Our only concern with the submitted plans is that an extant moated site surrounding Shepherd's Farm which is adjacent to this development phase, was identified during the course of the evaluation and has been shown to extend into the development area.

This feature was surveyed during the work, however, I am waiting for the report on this. I have asked the TW archaeological consultant for this report and relevant plans showing the extent of the moat.

I note on the submitted layout plan that an easement is shown running very close to the moated site and also that the attenuation ponds are again situated close to this area.

We would therefore advise that this survey information should be taken into account when determining this RM application to ensure that the moat isn't going to be disturbed during the work.

As long as all groundworks are located at least 5m from the edge of the moated site and this feature can be fenced off until all groundworks in this part of the site are completed in order to protect it, then we wouldn't object to the current plans.

However, if the moat will be disturbed as a result of the current development proposals, then we would advise that plans should be amended to allow this moat to be left undisturbed.

BMSDC Air Quality

No comments.

BMSDC Land Contamination

No comments.

BMSDC Environmental Health-Noise/Odour/Light/Smoke

No objection – these matters to be dealt with by discharge of condition.

SCC Flood and Water

No objections – the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment.

Suffolk Police

commend the developers for putting in back to back gardens and positioning properties in such a way that in the main they allow both formal and natural surveillance to occur. Applaud the designer's comments within their proposals stating "The design principles also take account of various design guidance

documents, including the "Suffolk Guidance for Parking", Building for Life, Manual for Streets, and the Suffolk Design Guide."

Advise the developers seek Secure by Design National Building Approval membership from Secure by Design (SBD).

However, points were raised concerning the incorporation of a flying freehold, garages being set too far back and the presence of rear parking yards and alleys. Concerns were also raised over the location of the sub-station and the possibility that public open areas might be used by motorbikes or mopeds.

OFFICER'S COMMENT – The applicant has responded to this by proposing PIR lights, amended lighting and fencing with trellis to courtyards as well as extra security gates. The Police are largely satisfied with these amendments.

Strategic Housing

Affordable housing suitably located, note that 4-bed flats should be 70m², more General Needs Shared Ownership dwellings required, noted that, in the market housing, the number of 2 beds is vastly under-provided and the number of 3 beds is over-provided against the relative percentages in the most recent SHMA. Request that the mix is amended to see some 2 and 3 bed bungalows to provide a better mix and provide more choice for a range of purchasers across different age groups.

The applicant has responded as follows: *"The affordable housing mix was discussed with the Housing Enabling Officer at MSDC during preapplication discussions, and the proposal takes account of the advice received. It has also taken into account previous applications and has been guided by the percentage and mix agreed within the S106 Legal Agreement."*

It is further noted that the only unit which falls under the size thresholds is Plot 157, which is a flat over garage (FOG).

The applicant has further explained *"The mix of shared ownership and rented are all as per the agreed viability schedule. Smaller units will continue to be provided across the next phases. If the 3-beds are reduced to 2-beds at this stage, it means they will need to be more 3-beds provided at the next stage instead. This approach to size and mix and how this will be divided over the phases of Chilton Leys has been accepted by the Case Officer and by members."*

In terms of open market housing, this again is in accordance with the agreed viability schedule, with the mix and density being appropriate for this part of the development.

There are to be some affordable bungalows provided on a later phase of the development but not on this current phase. There are to be no open market bungalows provided."

B: Representations

One letter of objection was received from the owners of Shepherds Farm:

1) *Previous Compliance Conditions - We urge strict adherence to the previously instated compliance condition 9.7 (and noted on p24 of the Planning Statement document) regarding landscaping around Shepherds Farm and the Paupers Graves being a priority in phase 2 development.*

2) *Phasing Plan - We implore lessening and shortening the impact time on Shepherds Farm by building the nearest dwellings first. Currently the 3rd nearest, across the main field and in direct view of the South West facing windows on all 3 floors, are scheduled to be built 10th out of 14 – as shown on the document 'Adoption and management plan (20824/amp/01)'. Bringing the construction of these dwellings forward*

would greatly reduce the timescale that Shepherds Farm has to endure impact from construction, possibly by a number of years.

3) *Footpath Next to Southern Corner Boundary of Shepherds Farm - Shepherds Farm is currently set within fields with a grass footpath next to it, a hard tarmac/asphalt surface will completely change this setting from rural to urban. Could a porous or gravel type surface, giving a softer more rural surface be used? This would also be more in keeping with the current gravel footpath running along the front of Shepherds Farm. This point and recommendation was also previously proposed by the Environment Agency within the outline planning application (Application no. 5007/16).*

4) *Height of Dwellings - Why are there no 2.5 storey dwellings on the 'field views' side for phase 1 (dwellings situated along Shepherds Lane side of development), yet 50% with 'field views' in phase 2 are proposed as 2.5 storey dwellings? The phase 2 dwellings will face/overlook Shepherds Farm, Phase 1 dwellings don't.*

Discussion regarding new dwellings overlooking Shepherds Farm is noted in the Committee Report for application 5007/16.

PART THREE – ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION

1.0 The Site and Surroundings

- 1.1 As an overall description of Chilton Leys Phase 2 - this is currently agricultural fields to the north and west of the existing Chilton Hall Housing Estate and Chilton Fields Sports Club. Essentially it wraps around the Chilton Fields Sport Club.
- 1.2 The northern boundary is marked in part by Shepherds Lane, a private drive with a public footpath (FP35) running along the edge of the field that serves Shepherds Farm (Listed Building) and Woodfield Farm situated a little further beyond the site. The same boundary is then existing hedgerow as you go westward and is adjacent to further fields. The exception to this is a little piece of the site that extends around to the back of Shepherds Farm, while this is field it is intended this becomes an attenuation basin.
- 1.3 The east boundary if not the Chilton Fields Sport Club is Phase 1 Chilton Leys of 215 dwellings, primary school and employment site that is now being constructed.
- 1.4 At the north west corner is Chilton Leys Farmhouse enclosed with a small wooded area and its long tree-lined driveway forms part of the west boundary for the site become joining up Forest Road and Starhouse Lane. The trees along the drive are protected via a TPO order. The remaining west boundary is then Starhouse Lane where Starhouse Farmhouse is located on the opposite side of the road and enclosure by mature landscaping that also forms part of Fieldens, an industrial site.
- 1.5 The rear of two detached properties that front Union Road form the further southern boundary of the site. Paupers Graves site, a VI OS designation, also forms part of the southern boundary of the site. There is no access to Union Road from the site given other 3rd party interests and this is not possible to achieve. However, there is a public footpath between Chilton Meadows Residential and Nursing Home and Chilton Fields Sports Club that leads from the site to Chilton Way. The site itself constitutes the northern third of the above.

- 1.6 The site is not in, adjoin or near any Conservation Area. At the north-eastern corner, the Grade II listed Shepherds Farmhouse and its curtilage constitute a “bite” out of the development site. 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.
- 1.7 The site measures 4.28 ha. It is located in Flood Zone 1. Public Right of Way loops around the site (save for the eastern-most lip), linking Thornhill Road to The Slade) and southern and eastern boundaries (broadly linking Onehouse with Stowmarket).

2.0 The Proposal

- 2.1 The application seeks detailed Planning permission for one phase of the housing development granted permission in outline in July this year (600 dwellings, reference 5007/16).
- 2.2 The proposal at hand is for x175 dwellings. At a gross site area of approximately 10 ha, this clearly equates to approximately 17.5 dwellings per ha.

3.0 Policy Background

3.1 Core Strategy and Focused Review

- 3.2 Policy CS1 provides that the majority of employment, retail and housing development shall be directed to towns and key service centres. Policy CS2 provides a list of possible development in the countryside. The SMP as part of the development plan should be read in conjunction with the Core Strategy and allows in principle for the development of Chilton Leys.
- 3.3 Policy CS3 (in part based on the now revoked East of England Plan) encourages sustainable construction and for dwellings to achieve a three-star rating under the Code for Sustainable Homes. However, while encouraged, this is not a specific requirement and in any event Code Sustainable Homes as also been revoked. Accordingly, only very limited weight can be given to this policy at this time.
- 3.4 Policy CS4 provides that all development will contribute to the delivery of sustainable development and reflect the need to plan for climate change and then outlines issues of flood risk, pollution and biodiversity. Also included is encouragement of the implementation of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDs) that this application does include such provision within its proposals. There are no principle issues raised in CS4 to resist the proposed development or make it contrary to the development plan.
- 3.5 Policy CS5 provides that all development will maintain and enhance the environment, including the historic environment, design and landscape and retain the local distinctiveness. There are no principle issues involved in this policy given this is an outline application.
- 3.6 Policy CS6 provides the need for consideration of appropriate infrastructure and what may be considered. In this case the SAAP also provides a list of possible consideration of supporting infrastructure as too does the Development Brief SPD adopted. This will be considered further in the assessment below. However, it is noted that there is no priority order of such infrastructure considerations nor that an application should be refused for failing to include any specific element

of infrastructure. The one exception is in relation to public transport considerations and on this basis the development proposes to complete its investment into public transport begun in Phase 1 by paying for a new bus service to serve the site. Equally this would also serve the Union Road development given the available route to complete the commercial loop. Accordingly, this policy offers no principle issues to resist the proposed development.

- 3.7 Policy CS9 provides requirements on the density and mix of new housing development. The policy seeks a mix of types, sizes and affordability in terms of residential schemes, but does not set any specific levels or percentages to achieve. The policy also provides that new development should provide an average density of at least 30 dwellings per hectare. In this proposal a density of 34 dwellings per hectare is proposed if you take the housing area only and fulfils this requirement (the same as phase 1).
- 3.8 While the policy also provides that a higher density of at least 40 dwellings per hectare may be achieved in more sustainable locations and this would include Stowmarket, being an edge of town site it is considered that the proposed density is suitable and appropriate in this location with consideration to the adjacent Chilton Hall estate.
- 3.9 Core Strategy Focused Review (CSFR) 2012 policy FC3 provides that major new allocations of employment land should be situated primarily in or close to towns with good access to the districts major transport routes and good access by public transport. The policy also includes allocation of employment land within the Chilton Leys allocation and this has been dealt with under Phase 1 of the Chilton leys development. The proposal includes the development of a local retail units and employment opportunities in terms of recreation use and building works required. Accordingly, the development is not considered to be in conflict with Policy FC3 nor is it contrary and the principle of the development is accepted.
- 3.10 The CSFR was adopted by Full Council on 20 December 2012 and should be read as a supplement to Mid Suffolk's adopted Core Strategy (2008). This document updates some of the policies of the 2008 Core Strategy as already addressed above. The CSFR document does introduce new policy considerations, including Policy FC 1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development that refers to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) objectives and Policy FC 1.1 - Mid Suffolk approach to delivering Sustainable Development that provides "development proposals will be required to demonstrate the principles of sustainable development and will be assessed against the presumption in favour of sustainable development as interpreted and applied locally to the Mid Suffolk context through the policies and proposals of the Mid Suffolk new style Local Plan.
- 3.11 Proposals for development must conserve and enhance the local character of the different parts of the district. They should demonstrate how the proposal addresses the context and key issues of the district and contributes to meeting the objectives and the policies of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy and other relevant documents."
- 3.12 Neighbourhood Plan/Supplementary Planning Documents/Area Action Plan
- 3.13 The Stowmarket Area Action Plan was adopted 21st February 2013. This provides a few new policies in respect of this site as well as overarching policies that apply to relevant housing or commercial development within the defined Action Plan area. Several these policies will be addressed in the appropriate sections below, but none seek to resist the principle of development or its phasing.

3.14 Specifically, Paragraph 6.58 through to 6.70 of the SAAP refers to the Chilton Leys allocation and includes SAAP policies 6.5 to 6.12 with policy 6.5 itself allocated the site for mix use, including residential, employment and open space. Policy 6.6 seeks the development brief that was adopted on the 16th December 2013. Policy 6.7 allocates a new VIOS for the Paupers Graves and this phase does not include this site, but will be adjacent.

3.15 Saved Policies in the Local Plans

3.16 Members will be aware that the weight to be attached to the 1998 Local Plan must be considered carefully by reference to the NPPF to ensure consistency.

3.17 The saved Local Plan through policies GP1, H 13, H 15, H 16, and T10 supports good design that reflects Suffolk character, avoids adverse impacts on amenity and considered traffic and highway implications of development. Policy HB1 while not wholly NPPF compliant refers to setting of historic buildings and along with other policies including employment matters shall be considered in the detailed assessment below. This development would normally be contrary to local plan policy H7, but is not the case as an allocated site within the SAAP and there are no other principle issues against the development arising from the local plan.

3.18 The Principle Of Development

3.19 From an assessment of relevant planning policy and guidance, representations received, the planning designations and other material issues including the lack of a five-year land supply for housing; the main planning considerations considered relevant to this case are set out below including the reason/s for the decision, any alternative options considered and rejected. Where a decision is taken under a specific express authorisation, the names of any Member of the Council or local government body who has declared a conflict of interest are recorded.

3.20 Crucially, permission for housing on this site already exists in Outline form. The principle is, therefore accepted.

3.21 In a wider sense, the principle of development was established under the SAAP, Core Strategy and its review and the adopted SPD for Chilton Leys. Essentially the allocation itself has accepted the expansion of Stowmarket in the form proposed and there will be changes to the setting of listed buildings, footpaths and the relationship between One house and Stowmarket.

3.22 On consideration of the Core Strategy, Local Plan, SAAP and adopted Development Brief (SPD) officers consider that in broad terms there are no principle issues that the proposed phase two application is in conflict with. The proposed development includes all required elements as sought. by the local policy framework established for this allocation. Matters of detail are addressed in sections below.

4.0 Site Access, Parking and Highway Safety Considerations

4.1 Planning permission 5005/16 (“Application for full planning permission for highway and utilities infrastructure, including: main spine road, emergency access, drainage and attenuation, a pumping station, electricity substations and other utilities”) covered substantive highway matters in relation to Chilton Leys Phase 2.

- 4.2 The road development was granted permission under the above reference to support future outline and full applications for housing and was required up-front to provide/service gas lines (under the roads) to supply the school and infrastructure (linked to phase 1, previously approved and being built).
- 4.3 The road mentioned is to be the main estate road and is placed to ensure all other functions of the following phases can be service sufficiently.
- 4.4 The road in question has an emergency access/bus gate in its south-western corner, then forking north and east and joining the Bury Road at a point 100 metres north of Chilton Way. The bus gate is exit only. The Highway Authority had stated its preference for a two-way arrangement; however, such an arrangement was not necessary to the acceptability of the scheme. These matters were resolved within the outline and full applications.
- 4.5 Whilst the Highway Agency has raised no concerns (because the development has no immediate impact on the nearby A14 trunk road), the Highway Authority has requested various amendments and supplied several suggestions (see Consultations section, above). The developer has responded to these points.

5.0 Design and Layout

- 5.1 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.
- 5.2 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.
- 5.3 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.
- 5.4 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.
- 5.5 The layout is broadly in accordance with the master plan. Its northern-most section contains an attenuation basin. South of this, the easternmost section comprised a scheme of 28 houses which are to the north of the new school. To the west is the main parcel of 147 dwellings which is sliced through by the above-described spine road with a similar amount of housing on each side.
- 5.6 The northern section shows a number of private accesses and one main access road which forks into two smaller roads; to the south, and close to a proposed convenience store (not the subject of this application), one main estate road loops around to the south and west.
- 5.7 The development is completed in its south-western section with a community orchard to the south of the road and a play area (LEAP) to the north.
- 5.8 This morphology of the scheme also adheres loosely to the development brief. This brief shows “character areas” which have mostly been carried through to the application – namely the “Main Street” which spans east to west, backed by the “Community Focus” and “Neighbourhood Housing” sections; and the “Haughley Church View” and “Northfield Wood View” sections.

- 5.9 In more detail – the “Main Street” is wide, with wide cycle/footways and has taller buildings of 2 ½ - 3 storeys, with more of a continuous built form, parking generally behind the building line and, where possible, strong, formal landscaping.
- 5.10 The “Community Focus” element largely relates to the proposed convenience store outside of this site (as well as addressing the school – also outside of this site). It had earlier been the intention to build some form of community centre here. However, there was insufficient interest so, instead, the monies will be spent elsewhere on community facilities for the greater site towards the end phases of the scheme as secured by the Section 106 agreement.
- 5.11 The Haughley Church and Northfield Wood “View” sections are self-explanatory. Views of these key elements are available from the scheme; between the two main elements looking north towards the church and up the private way between the two north-westernmost blocks towards the woods. The “Neighbourhood Housing” section is a medium density residential area and is spread across the development in different locations.
- 5.12 The broad layout of the scheme shows it to be comprised of ten definable blocks, each logically hemmed by the buildings with only gardens and garaging in their interiors. The only exceptions are the large block to the west, which contains 30 units in total and a cluster of eight dwellings in the interior and the north-easternmost where unit 9 is adjacent to an internal parking court.
- 5.13 The residential provision is mostly housing, however a block of nine flats is shown in the centre of the site. This addresses the corner of the main road and the road which serves the southern half of the site.
- 5.14 Parking courts have been kept to a minimum, with none presented in the traditional regimented manner, instead tracing the shape of the road parallel. The biggest such court is around units 139-158, encompassing 15 parking spaces with a clear six metres to allow for manoeuvring.
- 5.15 The issue of “triple parking” which has been discussed in recent weeks has been acknowledged and review by the applicant, stating:

“(following) the detailed application for the road network and associated infrastructure, there is little room for movement as each of the phases of development are brought forward. The issue of triple parking has been acknowledged and sought to be addressed by Taylor Wimpey where possible and practical. The parking arrangements off adoptable highways, (which cause more concern to SCC Highways), has been revisited, as has the parking off private driveways, (although ‘private’ roads do not seem to have the same significance as the main roads).

It should be remembered that triple parking has been provided for some 3x bed properties, which is actually an over provision for this size of property (effectively meaning the provision of a garage is a ‘bonus’ to these properties).”

- 5.16 In detail, the number of instances of triple parking has been reduced to 26 (just over 14.8 per cent). This is HALF the amount that was originally submitted.
- 5.17 Given that the applicant is operating within the confines of an Outline permission granted and development brief that included a master plan before the issue of triple parking arose, this enormous reduction in triple parking can be considered quite an achievement. In addition to this, the matter is largely away from the public highway and the Highway Authority is not objecting. Furthermore, the

applicant is waiting to press on with the commencement of the next phase of delivery of much needed housing. This matter is, therefore, considered to be dealt with.

- 5.18 The house designs themselves are based on the development brief and are designed to refer to the character areas in which they sit. In reality there is some cross-over between the different areas.
- 5.19 The “Main Street” character area buildings boast eight different house types, with roofs facing on to the front and a mixture of rendered, brick and boarded buildings.
- 5.20 The “Haughley Church View” area has a similar mix of materials and architectural references, but the individual houses are generally larger with some extending to two and a half stories.
- 5.21 The “Northfield Wood View” character area which fringes the west of the site, comprises an eclectic mix of housing types with much in common with both of the above areas, ranging from slender plots to larger dwellings and a few two and a half storey units.
- 5.22 The “Community Focus” area attempts to stitch together two geographically distinct parcels – namely those on the eastern and western sides of the site in the vicinity of the school and shop. The range of buildings here does present some differences, notably with the three-storey apartment block (nine flats) and the triple flat over garage (FOG); some similar stock to the other areas is also included.
- 5.23 The “Neighbourhood Housing” group hides within the perimeter of the northern block, forms the southern half of the southern block and also includes a few dwellings in the eastern-most extremity of the smaller group of housing to the north of the school. These are mainly brick and are generally a smaller housing type.

6.0 Landscape Impact, Trees, Ecology, Biodiversity and Protected Species

- 6.1 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.
- 6.2 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.
- 6.3 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.
- 6.4 Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy requires development to protect, manage and enhance Mid Suffolk's biodiversity.
- 6.5 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.
- 6.6 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.

- 6.7 The Outline permission was accompanied by An Ecology Report. The Reserved Matters application shows the attenuation ponds to the north to contain wet wildflower grassland planting (Emorsgate) with different wildflower planting (the Germinal mix) surrounding it. The northern fringe of the site is to be dotted with new woodland and deciduous thicket planting.

7.0 Heritage Issues

- 7.1 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. 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.

- 7.2 The site is not in, adjoining, or near any Conservation Area, nor does it contain any listed buildings. It does, however, surround the Grade II listed Shepherd's Farm on three sides. The listed building is hard up against the boundary of the development site and its setting does require consideration. However, the building has been treated with respect with open space and planting meaning that the nearest building is 50 metres away. The attenuation basins were approved under the main road and infrastructure full application.

- 7.3 The Council's Heritage Team raised two points of concern – namely that neither rendered gables over pentice boards nor the use of fibre boarding, was acceptable in respect of the design aspects of the scheme, but raised no objection overall nor objected to the impact to the Listed Building (accepted in part by the allocation of the site and outline permission)

- 7.4 Amendments have been received which show the rendered gables to be replaced by full brick gables and some (but not all) of the boarded houses replaced with render to address the heritage matters raised. In conclusion it is considered that there is no harm on the Listed Building to warrant refusal.

8.0 Impact on Residential Amenity

- 8.1 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.

- 8.2 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.

- 8.3 Other than the substantially separated above-mentioned farmhouse, the only existing neighbouring property with a common border is 23 Masefield Drive to the south. That house is approximately 40 metres from the nearest new dwelling, with the nearest part of its garden being separated from the nearest new plot by 25 metres of Public Open Space.

- 8.4 Also, to be considered are the future occupants of the new housing site to the east. Six of the new dwellings border, or are close to, the application site at hand. Analysis shows that all of these have their fronts or sides facing the site, and that the site itself has all front facing windows looking on to that development. In addition, the new and recent dwellings are separated by two internal roads

(one on each site). This gives a building-to-building separation of about 20 metres. There is, therefore, no chance of any uncomfortable overlooking.

- 8.5 Where the buildings draw closer to each other at the north-eastern corner, proposed house 24 is about six metres away from a house on the neighbouring site. There is potential for some mutual overlooking between this dwelling and one across the cycle-path. However, these units are all owned by the same developer and the idea is for surveillance of the path, as recommended by the police. Any future occupier will be aware of the situation that they are buying in to.
- 8.6 Other than this minor point, given the separation between the two sites there is no identifiable harm to residential amenity. The proposal responds favourably to local Policies H13 and H16.

9.0 Flooding and Drainage

- 9.1 The site is within Flood Zone 1, so there are no inherent problems. As a major application of more than 1 hectare, the application required a Flood Risk Assessment which, as reported above, is acceptable to our Floods team.

PART FOUR – CONCLUSION

10.0 Planning Balance and Conclusion

- 10.1 The site in question is part of a wider site which benefits from Outline Planning permission. This permission, itself, complies with an Area Action Plan and local policy designation. There is, therefore, no question that the application is acceptable in principle.
- 10.2 Further, the broad layout of this phase complies with the illustrative plans in the development brief.
- 10.3 The application is well supported by a comprehensive package of specialist reports that demonstrate how the scheme has been developed in a manner that responds positively to the site constraints. The Design and Access Statement demonstrates that the design has evolved through engagement with the local community.

11.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 11.1 (2) That planning permission be granted, subject to conditions listed at 11.3.
- 11.2 *By way of clarification, Members are reminded that the following conditions were imposed at Outline relevant to this application and do not need to be repeated here:*
- Time limit
 - Phasing
 - Archaeology
 - Flood risk
 - Construction management
 - Rainwater harvesting
 - Provision of fire hydrants
 - Removal of permitted development rights
 - Tree protection

- Materials
- Landscape management
- Foul water drainage
- Super-fast broadband

Also included and not relevant to this phase:

- Restriction of operating times
- Restriction of open air storage
- Illumination
- Use class restriction

11.3 Conditions recommended to be imposed on this reserved matters application:

- Approved Plans
- Garages to be used only for parking of vehicles/storage of household items
- Works to comply with ecological enhancements