

## Committee Report

**Item No: 2**

**Reference:** 1866/17

**Case Officer:** Mark Russell

**Ward:** Bacton and Old Newton

**Ward Member:** Jill Willshaw

---

### RECOMMENDATION – GRANT OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION WITH CONDITIONS

---

#### Description of Development

Outline planning application with Access, Landscaping and Layout to be considered for the erection of up to 56 dwellings with vehicular access from Finningham Road, Old Newton. Appearance and Scale to be the subject of a Reserved Matters application.

NOTE – This has now been reduced to 47 dwellings.

**Location:** Finningham Road, Old Newton

**Parish:** Old Newton with Dagworth

**Expiry Date:** 28.08.2018

**Application Type:** Outline planning application

**Development Type:** Major Small Scale - Dwellings

**Applicant:** Mr M Stearman On Behalf Of the Stearn Family Trust

---

### 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

3814/16 - Application for Outline Planning Permission dealing with Access, Landscaping and Layout, (Appearance & Scale to be the subject of a Reserved Matters application) for the construction of 59 dwellings with vehicular accesses from Finningham Road and Silver Street, Old Newton. Withdrawn 18.04.2017.

---

---

## **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

Suffolk Design Guide

## **Supplementary Planning Documents**

Suffolk Adopted Parking Standards (2015)

## **Consultations and Representations**

### **A: Summary of Consultations**

#### **Old Newton with Dagworth & Gipping Parish Council**

Objection due to the effect on the setting of the listed building, there are better sites, this is against national and local policy, more housing than is needed, traffic survey was not representative, extra traffic, road too narrow, parking pressure on Silver Street, run-off of water down Haugh Lane, flats are not in keeping.

In conclusion – due to the above, the density of development, drainage and infrastructure, refusal was recommended.

If approval is granted, suggest a footpath along Silver Street, acoustic screening and removal of windows facing Falconer Avenue and Rookyard Farm, footpath to the crossroads should be metalled, the pond should be fenced off and streetlighting provided.

This position was largely restated in March 2018, noting that the moat had now been scheduled as an Ancient Monument. This was then re-iterated on 1<sup>st</sup> August 2018.

#### **SCC Highway Authority**

No objection. However, clarification required as to whether the required visibility splays could be provided on Finningham Road.

Stipulated:

- Footpath only link to Silver Street;
- Footway connection needs to be shown;
- Telegraph pole needs to be moved;
- Linking footpath should be 2 metres wide;
  
- Recommended: An informal footpath link across the open space;
- Therefore no additional footpath links required;
- Increase width of private driveways to plots 26 to 34;
- Extra parking for Plot 1.

Visibility splays on Finningham Road should also be kept clear of any landscaping.

On re-consultation, the HA responded (19<sup>th</sup> December 2017) that it was “content that suitable conditions may now be recommended” and eight conditions were proposed.

Further consultation in July 2018 led to the following response:

“I confirm that the revised drawings are acceptable in highway terms and my previously issued conditions are still applicable although drawing references should be updated appropriately.”

### **Essex and Suffolk Water**

No objection, but condition that a water connection is made to the network.

### **Anglian Water**

No objection to waste water and foul sewerage disposal, but unable to comment on surface water disposal as does not relate to AW assets. Advise speak to Flood Authority and the Environment Agency if the discharge is into a watercourse. Re-consult AW if it is intended to connect to its assets.

### **BMSDC Heritage**

Initially objected due to “less than substantial harm” to the listed building. Recommended a further reduction in units.

On re-consultation (22<sup>nd</sup> January 2018) Heritage confirmed that it still adjudged the scheme to cause “less than substantial harm”, but welcomed the green buffer between the development and the moat. It asked for a detailed landscaping scheme, should approval be recommended.

Following the scheduling of the moat, it stated (March 2018) that its recommendation had not changed, but added, in light of this scheduling that “any harm should be considered NPPF Paragraph 132....which expects great weight to be given to the conservation of heritage assets....the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be.”

Another response given 01/08/18 and again 17/10/18.

### **Gardens Trust**

Objection, adding: “the moats have been listed as Scheduled Ancient Monuments which adds an even greater level of significance to an important historical site.”

### **Suffolk Wildlife Trust**

Objection (13<sup>th</sup> July 2017) due to lack of information on protected species (newts, reptiles, bats) also stated that further breeding birds survey required if no works commenced by July 2018. **Place Services (Ecology)** Initial objection in the absence of sufficient information, but withdrew this objection in July 2018 on receipt of this information, subject to securing biodiversity information and enhancement measures.

### **Natural England**

No comments.

### **Environment Agency**

No comments.

### **County Development Contributions Manager**

No objections, subject to standard CIL contributions (e.g. School funding of approximately £412,253 and Library funding of approximately £90,000).

### **County Archaeological Service**

No objections, subject to standard archaeological conditions.

### **Waste Management**

No objections. Asked for properties to have unique collection points and assurance that roads could carry 32 tonne refuse freighters.

### **SCC Fire and Water**

No objections, standard informatives and guidance.

### **BMSDC Land Contamination**

No objection. Please advise if any unexpected contamination is encountered.

### **SCC Flood and Water**

An initial holding objection (28<sup>th</sup> June 2017) as the applicant needed to demonstrate they had the right to discharge in to a watercourse.

This information was provided in September 2017 and the objection was withdrawn, subject to conditions.

### **Arboricultural Officer**

No objections, subject to compliance with the submitted Tree Protection Plan.

### **Strategic Housing**

Largely approve of market housing offer, although disappointed at the removal of bungalows. Affordable housing offer is acceptable.

### **Historic England**

The nearby moat became scheduled as an Ancient Monument during the application (February 2018) and Historic England (HE) asked for the setting of it to be assessed at that point. Whilst it did not object to this application, it stated that this assessment was required.

On re-consultation, it responded (1 August 2018):

“Although we do not object in principle to the development of this land; we have concerns about the level of information provided, and that the application currently fails paragraph 189 of the NPPF (previously paragraph 128) and recommend these and our other points [including the drawing of water away from the moat, proximity of the “flats” to the moat, the presence of a 1.3m high fence, fear that attenuation ponds could have an impact on archaeology- see full consultation reply] are addressed prior to submitting revised application. We are increasingly concerned about the lack of information provided by the applicant in relation to the impact upon of the development upon the significance of the moat through a development within its setting. The new revised layout also provides new concerns in relation to the pond and rainwater attenuation.”

The applicant has subsequently clarified that:

*“The proposed surface water system on site including the proposed Weholite attenuation tank under the POS area will be a completely sealed attenuation solution and will not affect the existing adjacent moat.”*

HE has responded (2<sup>nd</sup> October 2018): “The attenuation system information is very helpful and we accept that it is unlikely to impact the water levels in the moat and therefore this is acceptable.”

### **B: Representations**

20 neighbour letters of objection were received at the time of the first consultation (June-July 2017). On further consultation, following amendments, there were further objections - seven in February and March 2018 and four in July 2018.

The nature of objections covered a wide-range of issues, which can be loosely grouped as follows:

- General dislike of proposal
- Boundary Issues
- Outside the settlement boundary
- Could lead to larger number of homes.
- Drainage (would add to flooding in Haugh Lane).

- Heritage concerns (In Conservation Area, harm to Listed Building, error in Heritage Assessment – not including surrounding moat and garden as heritage asset, open space needs to be reconsidered to maintain historic landscape character of Rookyard Farm moated site).

Landscape (Application fails to appreciate the importance of the wider rural landscape setting of the farmstead and also the very nature of a dispersed settlement pattern. The development would result in the farmstead being on the edge of the developed area rather than separated from it).

- Health & Safety

- Affects Local Ecology (We keep honey bees. Fear increase in noise and loss of habitat could cause us to lose the colony).
- Light Pollution
- Loss of Open Space
- Strain on existing community facilities (such as schools and healthcare).

- Traffic or Highways (Inadequate Access, no footpaths along the Old Newton to Finningham Road - and the road is not wide enough to have them - cars and motorbikes are prone to speed, proposed road through the centre of the planned development not suitable for movement of "Emergency Vehicles", Houses should front on to their own access roads, Visitors and two car families will have nowhere to park).

- Trees
- Sewerage issues
- Exceeds Housing Needs Survey by 30.
- Parts of the field are "protected".

Plan shows a footway from the development linking to an existing footway outside No 20 Silver Street. No such footway exists.

Residential Amenity (Loss of privacy, loss of View, noise, overlooking - dominating and overbearing; Placing of 15 car parking spaces immediately behind No's 22 to 32 will cause a massive increase in noise and disturbance in the rear gardens of the properties).

The normal yellow planning notice which is normally displayed at or near the proposed development is absent.

Loss of hedge

Fear of Crime

Plans do not show that every home owner to Falconer Avenue owns 0.5m of land outside their rear boundary.

Proposing flats in this area would look alien.

On re-consultation following amendments, five and then (after further amendment) four objections were received from neighbours.

In addition to neighbours, The Suffolk Preservation Society initially objected (July 2017) due to the effect on the setting of the Grade II listed Rookyard Farm. It modified this response in November 2017, welcoming the increased green area at the entrance to the site. However, it was concerned at the lack of information about landscaping. On further consultation on 6<sup>th</sup> March 2018 it noted that the setting of the moat had been taken into account and had no further comments to make. It further commented on 16<sup>th</sup> March 2018 as follows:

“..It has been brought to our attention that the three pairs of flats (nos 7-12) located at the far north east of the development, at their closest, are within a mere 15m of the scheduled ancient monument....our archaeological advisor...advised that ....this is likely to cause harm to the setting of the highly designated heritage asset.

Therefore, we believe the flats should be moved significantly further away from the boundary in order to safeguard the monument’s setting together with the provision of additional tree planting...”

The Suffolk Gardens Trust also objected for the same reason as well as the setting of the moat and because the site is outside of a Built Up Area Boundary. Following re-consultation, it maintained its objection, adding the setting of Rookyard Farm Moat as a reason for refusal.

---

## **PART THREE – ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION**

---

### **1.0 The Site and Surroundings**

- 1.1 The Village of Old Newton is approximately 3km north of Stowmarket.
- 1.2 The site measures 2.54 ha and is at the northern end of Old Newton. The land is behind and to the north of Falconer Avenue and between Silver Street and Finningham Road. Formerly two fields, it is now one and is known as “The Field”.
- 1.3 There is a boundary hedge to the north of the site and agricultural fields beyond this and a small wooded area on the eastern edge (next to the B1113).
- 1.4 Whilst the application documents describe this as an “infill” development, it is in fact a backland scheme behind the back gardens of houses to the south (on Falconer Avenue).
- 1.5 Of heritage significance, to the north (eastern end) of the site is the Grade II listed Rookyard Farm. Between the farmhouse and the site is a screening of trees and also a moat.
- 1.6 Rookyard Farm moat was added to the Scheduled Ancient Monument register during the process of the application (February 2018).

## **2.0 The Proposal**

- 2.1. The proposal is an Outline Planning application. However, it does seek to secure Access, Landscaping and Layout at this stage (with scale and design to follow at Reserved Matters).
- 2.2 The proposal at hand is for “up to” 56 dwellings (now changed to 47). However, given that layout is being applied for, the use of the word “up to” carries no real meaning. The proposed layout drawings (and thus the number of units) is what is being applied for here.

## **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. This latter policy now carries very little weight, following the recent Woolpit appeal (reference APP/W3520/W/18/3194926). 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 has also been revoked. Accordingly, only very limited weight can be given to this policy at this time.
- 3.3 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.
- 3.4 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. However, it must also be stated that limited weight was also attached to this policy by the Inspector at the above-mentioned Woolpit appeal, in relation to the heritage requirements of this policy.
- 3.5 Policy CS6 provides the need for consideration of appropriate infrastructure and what may be considered. 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.
- 3.6 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 15 dwellings per hectare is proposed, the acceptability of this is assessed below. Being a fairly rural location, it is considered that the proposed density is suitable and appropriate in this location.

3.7 The Core Strategy Focused Review (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 1.1 - 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. 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."

### **3.8 Saved Policies in the Local Plans**

3.9 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.

3.10 The saved Local Plan through policies GP1, H13, H15, H16, and T10 support 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.

### **3.11 The Principle Of Development**

3.12 The site is outside of the Built-Up Area Boundary (BUAB) not allocated for housing in the Core Strategy or Site Allocations documents. The proven lack of a five-year housing land supply is of critical importance.

3.13 Old Newton is described as a Primary Village in Policy CS1 (Settlement Hierarchy) of the Mid-Suffolk Core Strategy.

3.14 A Primary Village such as this is ranked third behind Towns and Key Service Centres, Policy CS1 clearly stating: "The majority of new development (including retail, employment and housing allocations) will be directed to towns and key service centres, but also with some provision for meeting local housing needs in primary and secondary villages, in particular affordable housing." (Officer emphasis). As such the policies support some housing in this location inside the settlement boundary.

3.15 The lack of a five-year housing land supply also means that there is no ceiling on development, provided it is sustainable.

3.16 Therefore, even if the quantum of development exceeds local housing needs, this is, of itself, not sufficient to turn away extra units if the development is sustainable. These matters are considered below.

## **4.0 Sustainability**

4.1 There are three strands to sustainability – Environmental, Social and Economic.

4.2 Taking first the Environmental considerations - the development site is contiguous with, but outside the BUAB of Old Newton.

- 4.3 There is a village shop (with an ATM) 200 metres away, as well as a Chinese restaurant 300 metres off and a playing field, sports and social club 150 metres beyond that. There are also bus stops in the vicinity.
- 4.4 Further facilities are found 500 metres to the east of the main village of Old Newton in a small cluster of about 30 houses – these constitute the Parish Church of St. Mary and the Old Newton Primary School and the Methodist Chapel 500 metres north of that.
- 4.5 These latter facilities are attainable via a footpath (PRoW 4420), which runs parallel with Church Road, commencing just south of Whitegates Farm and emerging at St. Mary's church just opposite a hardened footway near to the school.
- 4.6 This may not be an attractive proposition, but in common with the existing householders in the main part of Old Newton, does represent a sustainable option of travel.
- 4.7 In total, whilst the full suite of facilities may not be in walking distance (reliance instead being on facilities in Haughley or Stowmarket), this does represent a reasonable offering.
- 4.8 Whilst accepting that there will be some car travel (potentially to the local High School at Stowupland, for example), the dependence on car-borne travel is offset by options of travel by foot, bicycle and bus.
- 4.9 Our Ecologists have found the development acceptable and welcome the biodiversity enhancements which are being proposed. These enhancements include ponds in the north-eastern and south-western corners, as well as areas of rough grassland and log piles for stag beetles. The proposal, therefore, can be seen as an environmental improvement.
- 4.10 Overall, therefore, the scheme is seen as environmentally sustainable.
- 4.11 Economically it is often claimed that one or two houses will “support local businesses” an argument that is barely credible given the limited amount of spend. In this case, with 56 dwellings and therefore in excess of 100 people and potentially nearer to 200, it is a safe presumption that the local shop and other local facilities will receive a boon.
- 4.12 To this, one can add the short-term economic benefit to builders during the lifetime of the construction. Overall, the site can be described as economically sustainable.
- 4.13 Socially the scheme is immediately adjacent to existing housing and links via footways to Finningham Road, Falconer Avenue and Silver Street. This would mean integration with the existing village, as would use of local facilities including the school.
- 4.14 The Housing Needs Survey has identified a local need. This is true of both market and affordable housing. Whilst the proposal exceeds that identified need and does not seek to explicitly tie the affordable provision to local people, it will nevertheless result in such a provision. This should assist the children of locals to remain in the village, helping to keep families together.
- 4.15 Whilst this will also bring in new people to Old Newton, potentially with no previous local connections, the development can still be considered to be socially sustainable due to its provision for locals and its physical connectedness with the village.
- 4.16 In conclusion, the proposal is considered to be sustainable under all of the three headings set out by paragraph 8 of the NPPF and also as a whole.

## **5.0 Site Access, Parking and Highway Safety Considerations**

- 5.1 The Highway Authority, having initially raised concerns, is now content that the proposed access on to the Finningham Road can be safely achieved. This will require visibility splays, which the applicant has shown to be achievable on land it owns and controls.
- 5.2 In terms of parking, the provision shown is largely compliant. There are nine plots (19 per cent of the units) which have triple-banked parking. There is an overprovision of parking spaces and these extra bays could be avoided by the repositioning of garages should this be deemed an issue.
- 5.3 In addition, one of the spaces for Plot 25 is shown to interfere with a turning head and should be conditioned out.

## **6.0 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 The proposed layout (which is a matter for consideration here) is logically east-west oriented, with dwellings mainly facing a single road. There is a small group of housing to the western edge which addresses a smaller access track.
- 6.3 The site also has a very generous amount of open space to the east, incorporating a pond. This allows the setting of the listed farmhouse and scheduled ancient monument (moat) to breathe, a lagoon to the south-west and a smaller area of open space in the centre of its northern edge.
- 6.4 The density can be considered to be low at 18.5ha (gross), but is not unacceptable given the location of the site and need to provide space to the surroundings.

## **7.0 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 applicant has submitted an indicative landscape scheme which is largely acceptable. However, this does require a consultation of our Landscape consultant, which had only just been done at the time of writing. The recommendation, therefore, will be premised on the consultant's approval.
- 7.5 Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy requires development to protect, manage and enhance Mid Suffolk's biodiversity.

- 7.6 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.
- 7.7 The application was accompanied by an Ecology Report and further specialist reports. The drawings shows the aforementioned attenuation ponds and rough grassland. In addition, the log piles will assist the protected species the stag beetle.
- 7.8 With the proviso that our Landscape Consultant is satisfied, these matters are, therefore, dealt with.

## **8.0 Heritage Issues**

- 8.1 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.
- 8.2 The site is not in, adjoining, or near any Conservation Area. However, Rookery Farm and in particular its moat (which was Scheduled during the determination of this application) figured highly during the process.
- 8.3 Historic England has withdrawn its objection and it satisfied (as is our in-house Heritage team) that the moat's setting is now sufficiently respected and its concern about ingress from the northern pond has been allayed following assurance from the applicant as to the containment method.
- 8.4 These matters are, therefore, satisfied.

## **9.0 Impact on Residential Amenity**

- 9.1 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.
- 9.2 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.
- 9.3 The only houses likely to be affected are on Falconer Avenue. These are generally 25 metres from the boundary of the site, with the new buildings between 10 and 15 metres away from that. This means there is no issue of overbearing or loss of light. The incidence of overlooking is, therefore, likely to be very slight.
- 9.4 One neighbour has complained about the positioning of car parking near to their boundary. This is noted. However, given the distances involved, this cannot be held to be a reason for refusal or amendment.
- 9.5 Given the potential extra overlooking could occur should loft conversions be considered, it would be prudent to remove Permitted Development Rights for these.

9.6 With this, there is, no identifiable harm to residential amenity. The proposal responds favourably to local Policies H13 and H16.

## **10.0 Flooding and Drainage**

10.1 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**

---

### **11.0 Planning Balance and Conclusion**

11.1 The site in question is not allocated, but Mid Suffolk does not have a five-year supply of housing land.

11.2 It has been shown to be a reasonably sustainable proposal environmentally, economically and socially and does not risk harm or result in adverse impacts which would significantly or demonstrably outweigh the benefits of doing so. As such the proposal complies with the requirements of the NPPF and Local Plan Policies.

### **12.0 RECOMMENDATION**

**(1) That subject to an acceptable landscaping scheme being provided to the satisfaction of the Landscape Architect, that authority be delegated to the Acting Chief Planning Officer upon completion of the legal agreement subject to conditions as summarised below and those as may be deemed necessary by the Corporate Manager:**

#### **Affordable Housing**

**(2) Conditions as summarised below and those as may be deemed necessary by the Acting Chief Planning Officer:**

- 47 Units only
- Time limit
- Approved Plans
- Landscaping concurrent with reserved matters
- Garages to be used only for parking of vehicles/storage of household items
- PD Removals for roof extensions and rooflights.
- Works to comply with ecological enhancements
- Development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment and balancing pond containment.
- Visibility splays and other Highways conditions.
- Water connection to the network

- Archaeology
- Tree Protection
- Unexpected contamination
- Layout to exclude parking space at plot 25.

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

- Pro active working statement
- Standard informatives

**(4) That in the event of the landscaping scheme referred to in Resolution (1) above not being secured within 6 months that the Acting Chief Planning Officer be authorised to refuse the application on appropriate grounds.**

**(5) That in the event of the Planning obligations referred to in Resolution (1) above not being secured within 6 months that the Acting Chief Planning Officer be authorised to refuse the application on appropriate grounds.**