

Committee Report

Item No: 4

Reference: DC/18/03615

Case Officer: Gemma Pannell

Ward: Lavenham

Ward Member: Cllr William Shropshire

RECOMMENDATION – APPROVE RESERVED MATTERS SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS

Description of Development

Submission of details under outline Planning Permission B/16/00437 - appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the erection of up to 25 residential dwellings

Location

Land north west and south west of Norman Way, Lavenham Suffolk

Parish: Lavenham

Expiry Date: 22/11/18

Application Type: Reserved matters

Development Type: Small Scale Major Dwellings

Applicant: Hartog Hutton Ltd

Agent: Philip Cobbold 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

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework

Babergh Core Strategy 2014:

- CS1 Applying the Presumption in favour of sustainable development in Babergh
- CS2 Settlement Pattern Policy
- CS3 Strategy for Growth and Development
- CS11 Strategy for Development for Core and Hinterland Villages

- CS15 Implementing Sustainable Development in Babergh
- CS18 Mix and Types of Dwellings
- CS19 Affordable Homes
- CS21 Infrastructure Provision

Saved Policies in the Babergh Local Plan (2006):

- CN01 Design Standards
- CR07 Landscaping Schemes
- HS28 – Infilling or groups of dwellings
- TP15 Parking Standards – New Development

Lavenham Neighbourhood Plan 2016:

- D1 Design and character
- D2 High quality design
- C2 Open spaces and Recreation Areas
- C4 Allotments

Supplementary Planning Documents

- Suffolk Adopted Parking Standards (2015)
- Rural Development and Policy CS11 (2014)
- Affordable Housing (2014)

Relevant Planning History

Outline planning permission B/16/00437 for the erection of 25 dwellings was granted in September 2017 following the Planning Committee's resolution to approve the outline application at its meeting in September 2016.

The outline permission included the approval of access (off Norman Way) as a detailed matter. The outline consent includes a raft of access related conditions, as recommended by the Local Highway Authority. Some of the access-related conditions are pre-commencement conditions (19, 21 and 23). To date, applications have not been made to discharge those access related pre-commencement conditions. As the detailed matter of access has already been approved and was not 'reserved' for later consideration and approval, and where the likely effects upon the local highway network were considered under the outline application, highway matters are not considered further in this report.

A section 106 legal agreement has been entered into, dated 14 September 2017, in accordance with the Planning Committee's September 2016 resolution. The agreement sets out obligations in respect to affordable housing, public transport infrastructure and PROW contributions, on-site open space provision, maintenance and management, and development commencement notice requirements.

The current application seeks approval of the outstanding reserved matters following the issue of the outline approval, those being appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.

A number of conditions of outline planning permission B/16/00437 require the submission of certain details concurrent with the application for approval of the reserved matters. These include a design code (condition 12), levels (condition 18) and allotments (condition 27).

A discharge of conditions application DC/18/03617 has been submitted concurrent with the subject application, seeking approval of information pursuant to conditions 12, 18 and 27. Application DC/18/03617 also seeks to discharge condition 13 (strategic open space and planting) and 14 (soft landscaping).

Consultations and Representations

During the course of the application consultation and representations from third parties have been received. The below is a summary of the responses received.

A: Summary of Consultations

Lavenham Parish Council

Recommend approval, subject to the following:

- The allotments must be made available for use before the development is completed and signed off, and no vehicular access to the allotments across Lavenham Walk.
- Native species only to be used in the proposed planting schedule

Note: It is understood that following concerns expressed by this Council about the proposed vehicular access to the allotments crossing the Lavenham Walk this is to be altered to providing 2/3 car parking spaces on the area adjacent to Plot 1, thus only allowing access by foot to the allotments. The Parish Council would expect a new plan showing the agreed revision to be produced.

SCC Highways

No objection subject to standard highways conditions.

BMSDC – Heritage Team

This application relates to the submission of details under outline application B/16/00437 and includes landscaping, layout and scale of up to 25 dwellings.

The scheme is overwhelmingly pastiche. The proposed dwellings are a collection of approximately late medieval forms, with Georgian influences and large pseudo-barns, finished either in render or timber cladding. The group includes the sometimes eclectic application of architectural details. This approach and the individual form of each property creates an overly conscious, Poundbury style development, which is incongruous to the back land setting of an historic timber framed village like Lavenham.

Currently therefore, the development does not accord with the requirements of s.72 of the P(LBCA)A1990. In terms of the NPPF the development is considered at the low end of less than substantially harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

Place Services – Landscape – Detailed comments on the layout and design of the scheme.

Place Services – Ecology

Holding objection due to insufficient ecological information

We have reviewed the submitted documents supplied by the applicant, and note that no ecological assessment has been provided for this application.

We have assessed the Suffolk Biodiversity Information Service species records to determine whether designated sites, Protected and Priority species are located within the vicinity of the development. The data search concluded that Reptiles and priority bird species have been determined immediately adjacent to the development and Great Crested Newts, Badgers and Brown Hare have recorded within a one kilometre radius from the red line boundary.

In addition, Lavenham Railway Walk County Wildlife Site is also situated immediately adjacent to this development.

We are therefore not satisfied that there is sufficient ecological information available for determination of this application and recommend that an Ecological Impact Assessment should be submitted prior to determination of this application.

This assessment should determine the likely impacts to the nearby locally designated site. It should also determine the likelihood of Protected and Priority species/habitat being present and affected by the proposed works. Appropriate ecological mitigation or compensation measures should be included, if required, to minimise any potential impacts from the development to Protected and Priority species/habitat. Reasonable biodiversity enhancements should also be provided to ensure that this application contributes to biodiversity net gain.

The recommended further information is needed to enable the LPA to demonstrate its compliance with its statutory duties including its biodiversity duty under s40 NERC Act 2006.

Suffolk Wildlife Trust

The proposed development crosses the Lavenham Railway Walk County Wildlife Site (CWS) and the Railway Walks Local Nature Reserve (LNR). This application does not include any assessment of the likely impacts of the proposed development on the CWS and LNR, nor were these impacts adequately assessed at the time of the Outline planning application (B/16/00437).

Also, whilst the Outline planning application was supported by ecological survey information assessing the likely impact of the proposed development on the application site (excluding the CWS and LNR), no such information appears to accompany this application. As the ecological information provided in support of the outline planning application is now over two years old, we recommend that further assessment is undertaken if the conditions on the site have significantly altered since the previous ecological survey work.

As currently presented we consider that the information provided fails to adequately demonstrate that the proposed development will not result in an adverse impact on biodiversity, in particular the Lavenham Railway Walk CWS and Railway Walks LNR. We therefore object to this application.

SCC - Flood and Water

Holding objection because the applicant has not demonstrate how the surface water drainage system features will be landscape so that they are both functional and mimic/enhance the surrounding landscape. The points below detail the action required in order to overcome our current objection:-

Submit a detailed landscape strategy for the site that includes details of how the surface water drainage system features will be planted.

BMSDC Environmental Health – Sustainability

The details submitted thus far do not involve sustainability issues.

Suffolk Secure by Design

Makes detailed comments as to how the scheme could be amended in order to achieve Secured by Design accreditation.

PROW Officer

No objection.

SCC Strategic Development

This planning permission has a S106A dated 14th September 2017 which contains planning obligations (PRoW improvements to FP12 & Bus stop improvements on Norman Way) in favour of the County Council. The reserved matters application will need to be linked with the existing S106A. Infrastructure mitigation for this scheme is also covered by the District's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Therefore, SCC intends on making an application to the District's CIL funding at the appropriate time when the development has commenced. SCC will reconsider the infrastructure mitigation and forecasts at the time of the application.

SCC - Archaeological Service

There would be no significant impact on known archaeological sites or areas with archaeological potential. I have no objection to the development and do not believe any archaeological mitigation is required.

BMSDC Contamination

No objection.

B: Representations

Two objections received, based on the following grounds (summary):

Lack of structural landscaping to boundaries.

Over reliance of bland garage blocks in the parking courts.

Parking courtyards – results in large areas of hard standing and would not be adequately overlooked.

The occupants of Plot 10 would over look Plot 11 and Plot 8

Final architectural details must have integrity e.g. high quality finishing materials, timber windows with reveals.

Lack of information - The proposed development is unsupported by an updated design and access statement, landscape assessment, heritage statement, artist's impressions, building for life assessment, street scenes and axonometric drawings.

The scheme must be subject to formal design review as required in the revised National Planning Policy Framework.

Affordable housing not tenure blind - The affordable housing (Units 2-6) would not be 'tenure blind'. They clearly lack the same detailing as the other dwellings and would therefore stand out as an enclave of dwellings within the development.

Poor landscaping - The main street through the development would be lacking in soft landscaping. The front gardens would be cobbles set in concrete which would have a hard unattractive character. The cobbled front gardens should be replaced by soften landscaping and low frontage boundary treatment (such as railings). This would provide visual harmony to the street scene. It would be advantageous for boundary walls to be set back behind soft landscaping (e.g. Plot 1) to soften their presence. Feature trees and landscaping should be provided to break up the parking courtyards. More features trees should be provided throughout the development.

Lack of an adequate gateway building.

Highway safety.

PART THREE – ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION

1. The Site and Surroundings

- 1.1 The site is to the west of Lavenham High Street, adjacent to the Built up Area Boundary of the village, to the north west of the historic core. The site is accessed from the High Street, via an unadopted road (Norman Way) which currently serves a number of business units and residential dwellings.
- 1.2 The site is bounded to the north by the disused railway line which is now a public footpath and provides access to a range of other footpaths beyond the application site. The site includes the provision of a pedestrian access to the High Street.
- 1.3 Part of the site is located within the Lavenham Conservation Area.

2. The Proposal

- 2.1 Approval of reserved matters in respect to appearance, landscaping, layout and scale are sought.
- 2.2 The layout of development very closely resembles the indicative layout presented in support of the outline application considered in 2017. Key elements of the development are as follows:
- Vehicular access via Norman Way (as approved at outline stage).
 - The development is centred on a central (no-through) street which acts as the main 'spine' of the development, attempting to reflect the traditional street form of Lavenham.
 - Limited front setbacks are provided, with hard landscaped frontages adopted, again seeking to reflect the established historic development character in the village.
 - Parking courts and garaging are generally located to the rear of built form.
 - Adoption of traditional vernacular architecture.
 - A range of two-storey, single-storey and 1 ½ storey dwellings are proposed.
 - Finishing materials include the typical traditional range - red brick, painted render, plain tiles, pantiles, slate and timber boarding.
 - Boundary treatments comprise a mix of hedges, brick walls and timber fences.
 - Proposed footpath link through the site from the High Street.
 - Land north of the railway walk I set aside for public open space and allotments.
 - Small landscaped open space pockets to the north of plot 1 and to the south of plot 2.

3. Lavenham Neighbourhood Plan

- 3.1 The Lavenham Neighbourhood Plan (LNP) was adopted in 2016. The LNP, which covers the period up to 2031, forms part of the development plan framework and full statutory weight is attached to it.

4. The Principle of Development

- 4.1 The principle of development has been established by grant of outline planning permission B/16/00437. The key test is whether the proposed appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of the development responds appropriately to the character and amenity of the area, having regard to relevant guiding development plan policies. Of particular relevance to the reserved matters at hand are saved Local Plan policies CN01 (Design Standards) and CR07 (Landscaping Schemes), Core Strategy Policies CS11 and CS15 and LNP Policies D1 (Design and character), D2 (High quality design) and C4 (Allotments).

5. Layout

- 5.1 The development layout is characterised by a central street with hard landscaped frontages. Council's Landscape Consultant is critical of this approach, contending that the lack of landscaping opportunity in front gardens along the main access route provides no interest with regards public realm and visual amenity.
- 5.2 The hard edge street character seeks to follow that of the historic village core. It is observed that this character is not limited to just the village core of the High Street, but is evident throughout much of the village. The vast majority of the streets feature hard landscaped frontages with minimal front setbacks, including the main thoroughfares of Church Street and the A1141, as well as secondary streets including Prentice Street, Bolton Street and Lower Road. There is a conspicuous absence of generously proportioned, landscaped front setbacks. Officers do not share the concerns of the Landscape Consultant regarding the lack of front garden landscaping. The proposed hard edge street character creates a more closely integrated arrangement of buildings and spaces, consistent with what is to be expected with lower order roads, as clearly expressed in the Suffolk Design Guide.
- 5.3 The proposed hard edge streetscape character is an acceptable design response given the prevailing village character and Suffolk Design Guide design principles. It is certainly much preferred to a street frontage that incorporates garaging and vehicle hardstands.
- 5.4 The Heritage Officer is critical of the series of *cul de sacs*, which they consider reminiscent of post war town expansion. Officers do not disagree that such a layout is reminiscent of post war town expansion. However, it is a legitimate design response supported by the Suffolk Design Guide which states that this form of development can be appropriate on a small scale. The development proposed is of a scale that officers consider the *cul de sac* arrangement to be acceptable. The Suffolk Design Guide states that the edges of a development could be made softer and more secluded using a *cul de sac* approach. This is exactly the approach adopted with the subject scheme. Moreover, owing to the shape and proportions of the site, officers are not convinced that there are many viable alternative roading layouts to the *cul de sac* approach that would work for this site.
- 5.5 The Heritage Officer is concerned that by virtue of the architectural forms and locations of the individual properties, the development creates an alternative village centre. Officers cannot see how the layout or arrangement of buildings creates an alternative village centre.

- 5.6 An objector is critical of the extent of the rear parking courts and suggests they lack passive surveillance and that they should be designed as private spaces, achieved by adding five bar gates at the entrance. The Landscape Consultant is also critical of this design element, commenting that the parking courts are overused and not overlooked. Officers consider the extent of parking hardstand areas to be acceptable given their rear of building locations. Most parking areas are flanked by double storey dwellings and therefore are afforded sufficient levels of passive surveillance. There is no significant urban design or amenity benefit in designing these spaces as private.
- 5.7 Siting buildings relatively close to the street gives the effect of a low speed environment. This is consistent with LNP Policy D2, which seeks to design streets in a way that encourages low vehicle speeds.
- 5.8 LNP Policy D2 requires proposals on the edge of development to apply a lower density to ensure an appropriate transition to the countryside. The scheme responds favourably to this design requirement, with a less dense layout proposed at the north west corner of the site.
- 5.9 LNP Policy D2 also requires edge of development proposals to incorporate good pedestrian and cycle permeability out into the countryside. The scheme very effectively achieves this requirement, with excellent pedestrian and cycle linkages connecting from the body of the village to the east with the railway path to the north. Pedestrian connectivity is significantly enhanced by the development, a significant planning benefit.
- 5.10 LNP Policy D2 seeks to ensure the provision of safe and attractive paths and routes within the development site, designed to link up easily with existing pedestrian networks outside the development site. As noted above, this is readily achieved by the scheme. The internal footpath network is a safe environment, with high levels of passive surveillance afforded to the public space, noting dwellings are oriented to the network where practical to do so.
- 5.11 LNP Policy C4 Policy C4 encourages proposals which provide for provision of public allotments. The scheme responds directly to this requirement, with generous provision of allotments provided north of the disused rail line. Council's Landscape Consultant is critical of the location of the allotments and proposed POS, concerned that it encourages vehicular use over walking and that they will not be easily accessible to the residents and existing residents of Lavenham. Officers disagree. The distance of the allotments from the development site and the body of the village is very short. It is highly unlikely that occupants of the development would drive to the allotments.

6. Scale

- 6.1 The proposed quantum of development, in terms of dwelling number, does not exceed the outline approval and is therefore acceptable.
- 6.2 LNP Policy D1 seeks to ensure development is of a height and scale that is in keeping with the neighbouring buildings. The LNP states that the local scale is predominantly two storey, with some accommodation provided within steeply sloping roof voids.
- 6.3 The development scale in terms of building heights is varied, ranging from single storey, one and a half storey, to double storey. These building heights are consistent with the building heights in the village. The development incorporates a pleasing range in building heights which adds visual interest and responds favourably to site context. The proposed development scale supports LNP Policy D1.

- 6.4 The scale of buildings can have implications for residential amenity. The proposed will not result in adverse overbearing, visual bulk, overlooking or overshadowing impacts for neighbouring residents or future occupants of the development. Siting of buildings has been carefully considered in this regard, ensuring that height impacts are suitably mitigated. It is noted that an objector is concerned with overlooking of plots 8 and 11 by plot 10, suggesting that the dwelling on plot 10 should be single storey. Plot 10 is single storey, as shown by the elevations depicted on drawing 32. There will be no undue overlooking impact from plot 10 on either plot 8 or plot 11.

7. Appearance

- 7.1 Council's Heritage Officer is critical of the pastiche approach that has been adopted. Pastiche architecture can have a deleterious effect on heritage streetscapes and the valued character of Conservation Areas. However, in the consideration of the outline application, the advice received from the heritage team was that the proposal would not cause harm to the appreciation of designated heritage assets within the vicinity of the application site or the morphology of the village within the meaning provided by the National Planning Policy Framework. The statutory tests provided by the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 are therefore capable of being fulfilled.

The site does not contribute to a valued heritage streetscape. As noted in the assessment of the outline application, the site sits to the rear of the more recent development that has taken place behind the listed properties in High Street. These listed properties are experienced more through their physical association with other properties in the historic core rather than the development and open land to the rear. The group of pastiche dwellings will result in very modest harm to the overall appreciation of these heritage assets. The valued setting of the nearby heritage assets will remain unaffected by the appearance of the proposed development, whether it be pastiche, overtly contemporary, or otherwise as considered within the outline application.

- 7.2 The boundary to the Lavenham Conservation Area closely follows the historic core and the main roads leading to and from the village. The site partially adjoins the Conservation Area on its southern edge however the intervening modern development on the higher ground to the south provides a clear distinction between the Conservation Area and the subject land. In considering whether the principle of development was acceptable in the Conservation Area it was concluded that whilst the application site partially adjoins the Conservation Area on its southern edge, the intervening modern development on the higher ground to the south provides a clear distinction between the Conservation Area and the undeveloped land to the north. As such the character of the Conservation Area, and views into and out of it within the immediate vicinity of the application site, would not be compromised by the proposed development. The overall impact is therefore likely to be neutral.

- 7.3 An objector notes that it is important that the final details have integrity, citing the need for high quality finishing materials, including timber windows with reveals. Officers wholly agree with these observations. Finishing details are important and low-grade finishing is not supported as it undermines the overall aesthetic and streetscape quality. Too often the architectural integrity of new development is given insufficient respect, to the detriment of the development itself and the character of the broader area. A detailed schedule of finishing materials, including samples and details of window reveals etc, will be required by planning condition.

- 7.4 In respect to finishing materials, the LNP sets out the prevailing village palette - timber frame and render, flint, gault clay and soft red brickwork, plain tiles and welsh slate. The proposed range of finishing materials is entirely consistent with the prevailing material palette.
- 7.5 The LNP observes that with respect to roof orientation, roofs are predominantly set parallel to streets. The scheme picks up on this design cue, with the majority of the proposed roofs sited parallel to the internal street network.
- 7.6 An objector is concerned that the garages are of poor architectural quality and that they are less likely to be used. Officers disagree. The garages are modest but of traditional design and appearance; they are of a standard domestic appearance. There is no evidence to indicate that the garaging will not be used; they are designed to standard compliant dimensions and conveniently sited relative to the dwellings they serve.

8. Landscaping

- 8.1 LNP Policy D1 expects proposals to retain and enhance vegetated boundaries as much as possible. The policy seeks to avoid hard edges directly into open farmland and encourages the creation of landscaped buffers.
- 8.2 The application is supported by a landscaping plan. The Landscape Consultant is of the view that new and existing vegetation and hedge planting is not clearly shown on the landscaping plan. Officers can readily determine which planting is existing and which planting is proposed. Officers agree with the Landscape Consultant regarding the absence of landscaping detail in respect to the northern POS/allotment area, in particular the extent of removal/retention of vegetation. Landscaping details for this discrete area can be secured by planning condition.
- 8.3 In respect to boundary treatments, the Landscape Consultant is concerned with close boarded fencing to the southern boundary of plots 11-14. This boundary is shared with the rear boundaries of residences immediately to the south. Close boarded fencing in a domestic setting, to the rear of dwellings unlikely to be visible from public vantage points, is commonplace and a perfectly acceptable design response. An objector suggests the incorporation of low frontage boundary treatments, such as railings. Officers agree that this would be advantageous to the streetscene quality. This said, the absence of such treatments are not, in their own right in the planning balance, sufficient to constitute a reason to refuse the application.
- 8.4 In respect to hard landscaping, the Landscape Consultant is critical of the use of bollards and cobble embedded concrete. These are features characteristic of the village, of many Suffolk villages, and are deemed acceptable.
- 8.5 Critical to the success of the landscape response is the proposed implementation and maintenance regime in respect to the proposed planting of the public open space areas. These details will be largely covered by the current condition discharge application noting the requirements of condition 13 (Strategic open space and planting).
- 8.6 It is also noted that the s106 legal agreement places the implementation, maintenance and overall management responsibilities of the public open space areas in the hands of the owners and for them to establish an Open Space Scheme detailing these requirements, to be submitted to and approved in writing by Council.

The s106 agreement states that the costs of the ongoing management of the public open spaces areas will be borne by the owners. The agreement requires the submission of an Open Space Scheme to Council prior to development commencing. The Open Space Scheme is critical to this proposal. It is beyond the scope of this assessment but it will require very careful consideration when submitted for Council review, as well as close scrutiny being applied to the current conditions discharge application.

- 8.7 In respect to public open space, an objector raises the issue of whether the access track to the attenuation area will be publicly accessible. Officers are of the view that this should be the case. The areas set aside as public open space will be determined through the Open Space Scheme that has not yet been submitted to Council.

9. Other Matters

- 9.1 Affordable housing is beyond the scope of this assessment, noting it has already been determined as acceptable by virtue of the grant of outline permission and secured by way of a section 106 legal agreement signed in September 2017.
- 9.2 The referral comments of the Ecology Consultant and Suffolk Wildlife Trust are noted. Biodiversity matters were assessed in detail as part of the outline application, noting that it was supported by an ecology report reviewed by referral parties, and ecological enhancements were subsequently sought via outline planning condition (10). There has been no material change in site conditions or other circumstances that warrants a review of this matter. The outline conditions are sufficient to safeguard and enhance biodiversity values.
- 9.3 The referral response of the SCC Flood Officer in respect to surface water management are acknowledged. Surface water disposal was assessed as part of the outline application and it was determined that this matter could be adequately managed by outline planning conditions (5, 6, 7 and 8). There has been no material change in site conditions or other circumstances that warrants a review of this matter. There is no evidence to suggest that the outline conditions are not adequate to appropriately manage surface water disposal.
- 9.4 Refuse area details are dealt with by an outline permission condition (12). It is not appropriate or necessary to address this matter by way of the current application.
- 9.5 Residential amenity in respect to construction hours is managed by outline planning condition 26.
- 9.6 Archaeology was assessed as part of the outline application with conditions 3 and 4 imposed to address potential adverse archaeology impacts. There has been no material change in site conditions or other circumstances that warrants a review of this matter.
- 9.7 The referral response of the Sustainability Officer is noted. An energy strategy is a requirement of the outline permission by way of condition 11. There has been no material change in site conditions or other circumstances that warrants a review of this matter.
- 9.8 The Secure by Design referral response raises a number of safety related design requirements, not all of which have are addressed by the development. Officers are of the view that if all requirements were to be met it would result in a scheme not appropriate for a rural village.

The amended proposal strikes the right balance in this regard, with officers concluding that it provides a sufficiently safe and secure environment for future residents.

- 9.9 An objector contends the application is not supported by sufficient documentation and that a design review is warranted. Officers are of the view that sufficient information has been provided to enable a suitably informed assessment to be undertaken. The application has been subject to review by suitably design-qualified (internal and external) parties. A further design review is not considered necessary.

PART FOUR – CONCLUSION

- 10.1 The principle of development is established by the previous grant of outline planning permission. The quantum of development, 25 dwellings, accords with the outline approval.
- 10.2 The scheme proposes a hard edge street character consistent with the prevailing village character, an acceptable design outcome. The street layout is appropriate given the shape and dimensions of the site and its relationship to adjacent development. The submitted design code, as required by outline planning condition 12, is acceptable.
- 10.3 Impacts in respect to heritage assets in the village were considered at outline stage, and the Heritage officer was content that the development would result in no harm. Design details are traditional and consistent with those encouraged in the LNP. Concerns raised by the Heritage Officer regarding street layout and design detail are not shared to the same extent by officers.
- 10.4 The layout offers excellent pedestrian and cyclist connectivity, with a footpath network integrating with the body of the village and railway walk to the north. The footpath network is afforded good passive surveillance and landscaped appropriately. Public open space areas will be designated through the Open Space Scheme separate to this application, as required by the s106 agreement.
- 10.5 Building heights respond positively to the established village scale, again consistent with LNP design policies. The landscape response is acceptable. The concerns raised by the Landscape Consultant are, in the main, not supported by officers. The location of the allotments north of the disused rail line is not unacceptable, easily accessible for existing village residents as well as future occupants of the development. The allotments represent a significant planning benefit for the village.
- 10.6 The details submitted in support of the reserved matters application are to a standard that is appropriate. The scheme's appearance, layout and scale, together with the landscaping response are acceptable and recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Acting Chief Planning Officer be authorised to approve reserved matters of appearance, layout, scale and landscaping subject to conditions including:

- Approved Plans