

Committee Report

Item No: 3

Reference: DC/18/04357

Case Officer: Mark Russell

Ward: Stowupland

Ward Member: Cllr Keith Welham

RECOMMENDATION – Approval

Description of Development

Outline Planning Application (All matters reserved) Erection of up to 70 dwellings.

Location: Land To The South Of Gipping Road, Stowupland, Stowmarket

Parish: Stowupland

Expiry Date: 01.01.2019

Application Type: Outline planning application

Development Type: Major Small Scale - Dwellings

Applicant: Gladman Developments Ltd

PART ONE – REASON FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE

The application is referred to committee for the following reason:

It is a 'Major' application for:

- a residential development for 15 or more dwellings.

Details of Previous Committee/Resolutions and Member Site Visit

None

PART TWO – POLICIES AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Summary of Policies

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

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
CL11 - 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
GP01 - Design and layout of development
H13 - Design and layout of housing development
H15 - Development to reflect local characteristics
H16 - Protecting existing residential amenity
T10 - 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
T9 - 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

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

Stowupland Parish Council

Stowupland Parish Council would like to OBJECT to this application and reasons for refusal:-

- *This site is not an allocated site for development in the current Mid Suffolk 5 year housing plan. Nor the emerging Stowupland Neighbourhood Plan which is currently with Mid Suffolk in statutory consultation stage;*
- *The cumulative impact of recent and yet to be commenced developments and this application will have a detrimental impact on the village character and landscape setting. As a primary village within an Ancient Plateau Claylands landscape character type, it would be expected that any emerging development should preserve or enhance these landscape characteristics. However, a proposal in this location will negatively impact the rural settlement fringe character;*
- *It is further development outside of the village settlement boundary in the countryside and using high quality agricultural land;*
- *This development will further erode the setting of listed building Columbine Hall;*
- *Concerns that the ancient Thradstones Meadow which is part of this application will lose its character by being over managed which would cause loss of the wildlife and nesting place of Skylarks. This meadow is highlighted in the Neighbourhood Plan as being an important feature that should be protected;*
- *Whilst the single access onto the A1120 may be considered by the applicant's highway consultant to be adequate for up to 300 homes we have great concerns that there will be long tail backs through the estate at busy times of the day as the A1120 is a very busy road, also most of the vehicles leaving the site will be turning right across a traffic flow. This could lead to a highway hazard as impatient drivers chance getting into a small gap in the traffic. It may also cause drivers that what to turn right turning left and finding rat runs through unsuitable country lanes;*
- *Shortage of school places and lack of capacity at Health Centres to accept new patients. Whilst the developers would put money into CIL for further increases in these facilities it is just not happening fast enough to keep up with the demand that all the current new housing in the area is placing on the education and health services.*

Stowupland Neighbourhood planning advisory committee

The Stowupland Neighbourhood Plan (NP) is at an advanced stage. The Submission version, September 2018, is currently out on consultation (Regulation 16). This finishes on 30th November, and the NP and responses to this consultation will be with the Examiner in early December. We expect the Examiner's report early in the New Year. Policies in the Stowupland NP should be afforded substantial weight when this application is considered.....

The response then listed several policies within the NP, which it considered the proposal to be in breach of. Then concluding:

The Stowupland Neighbourhood Plan has been three and a half years in preparation and has involved the whole community – approval of this proposal will undermine the NP and the process, and will further erode confidence in the local planning authority and the planning process.

Historic England

Development could result in harm to significance of Columbine Hall through further erosion of its rural setting. No objection to the principle of development but would suggest that the Council also consider if the landscaping belt to the northern edge of the site could be increased, allowing a deeper area of planting. The landscaping area between the currently proposed development and the previous one could also be removed and the open space give to the eastern edge of the proposed development to allow better screening of the houses from the open landscape.

Environmental Health

No comments

Natural England

No comments

Floods

Holding objection - whilst the applicant has provided a comprehensive assessment of the existing flood risk, has proposed a method for the disposal of surface water, they have not demonstrated that the watercourse they intend to discharge to have a positive outfall.

This holding objection was maintained on 14th December because insufficient information had been submitted and more was requested.

On 17th December, the further information was provided, but our Floods team requested information showing flow into an OS mapped watercourse.

Arboricultural Officer

No objection in principle to this application subject to it being undertaken in accordance with the measures outlined in the accompanying arboricultural report. Although a number of trees/small section of hedgerow is proposed for removal they are of limited amenity value and the loss will have negligible impact upon the character of the local area. If you are minded to recommend approval we will require a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan in order to help ensure harm is not caused to the trees scheduled for retention, this can be dealt with under condition.

Highways England

No objection

Environment Agency

No objection, guidance given on foul drainage.

Anglian Water

Standard response and advice

SCC Highway Authority

Would not support a site served off Gipping Road as there are inadequate pedestrian facilities and the junction with Rendall Lane has sub-standard visibility. However, if this site is served off the A1120 via the existing approved site, and provides an emergency access, as shown on the indicative plan, it will comply with requirement that no more than 300 homes are served off one access.

Conditions relating to:

- Access
- Refuse storage
- Water discharge
- Details of roads
- Roads up to binder level
- Cycle storage

Place Services (Ecology)

No objection, subject to securing biodiversity mitigation and enhancement measures.

Place Services (Landscapes)

More information required on the cumulative impact of this and other developments. Development would have a detrimental impact on the rural character of the area.

If approved – suggest several conditions.

Tree Officer

No objection, limited impact from removal of trees, Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan required if permission is granted.

Archaeology

No objection, standard conditions.

Natural England

No comments

SCC Fire and Water

Standard comments ((i.e. supply of fire hydrants and development to comply with Building Regulations).

SCC Strategic Infrastructure

Contributions towards land and build costs of a new primary school, pre-school provision, waste, libraries and affordable housing.

Heritage

Harm to heritage asset (Columbine Hall) by diminishing its rural character. If approved, boundary treatment should be considered.

Sustainability

Disappointing lack of commitment to low carbon. Commitment to this required or the application should be refused (or it could be conditioned).

Environmental Control (Air Quality)

No objection.

Environmental Control (other)

No objection, standard working hours conditions.

Strategic Housing

This site is a S106 planning obligation site so the affordable housing provided will be to meet district wide need hence the **743** applicants registered is the important number.

The housing register shows a district wide need by bedroom size as follows:

1 bed - 379
2 bed - 260
3 bed - 86
4 bed - 17
5 bed – 1

In line with current local policy, affordable rented and shared ownership units are the preferred affordable housing options to meet local housing needs

The following affordable housing mix is recommended:

Affordable Rent:

- 10 x 2b x 4p houses @ 79sqm
- 3 x 1b x 2p houses @ 58sqm
- 2 x 2b x 4p bungalows @70sqm
- 3 x 3b x 5p houses @ 93sqpm

Total: 18

Shared Ownership:

- 4 x 2b x 4p houses @ 79sqm
- 2 x 3b x 5p houses @ 93sqm

Total: 6

It is recommended that no flats are built for affordable rent or shared ownership on this site. This decision has been made in light of the adjoining site APP/W3520/W/15/3139543 where permission has been granted via appeal for 34 flats – (16 x 1b2p flats and 8 x 2b4p flats ‘open market’ and (10 x 1b2p ‘affordable rent’ flats). From a housing management point of view it is not good practise to have high numbers of 1 bed flats on any development.

B: Representations

Eleven letters of representation were received nine of these from neighbouring properties, one from the Suffolk Preservation Society (SPS) and one from a Planning agent. The neighbours and SPS objected. The Planning agent spoke on a different aspect as explained below.

The neighbour objections covered the following points:

- Not in line with the development plan;
- Outside of the Built up Area Boundary;
- Contrary to the Stowupland Neighbourhood Plan;
- Contrary to the Stowmarket Area Action Plan (SAAP);
- Babergh and Mid Suffolk *do* have a five year housing supply;
- Increase in traffic;
- Proposed entrance is dangerous;
- Proposed emergency access is dangerous;
- Light pollution;
- Harm to wildlife;
- Loss of green space
- Possible loss of footpaths through open space;
- Affect setting of Columbine Hall;
- Schools are at capacity;
- Strain on services – doctor’s, dentist’s etc;
- With this and other developments, becoming an “urban sleeper town”;
- The style is suburban;
- The houses are not needed;
- The site is on higher land and, therefore, visible;
- Unsustainable;
- Build phase would cause nuisance;
- Danger to pedestrians;
- Demand on sewerage system;
- The housing is “bog standard, ordinary and boring”;
- Housing not for locals;
- No amenities in the village;
- Babergh and Mid Suffolk *do* have a five year housing supply;
- Claim of “high quality” cannot be sustained as only Outline and will be sold on;
- Character of hay meadow will be undermined;

SPS echoed several of these points, also pointing to a landscape appraisal which identified the Walnut Tree Farm Plateau (on which this site sits) as being important to local identity.

It stated that if permission were granted, then a comprehensive planting scheme would be required and further consideration to the layout and landscaping on land adjoining Thradstones Meadow.

It also agreed with Historic England’s comments about the setting of Columbine Hall.

The Planning agent, The Pegasus Group, wrote on behalf of its client Bloor Homes, asking whether its client (which owns a neighbouring parcel of land) could build a further 30-40 homes on its own site (where it already has Planning permission) instead of the application site at hand

PART THREE – ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION

1.0 The Site and Surroundings

- 1.1 The site is agricultural land to the east of the village of Stowupland. To the north is Gipping Road, with the garden of an existing dwelling overlapping. To the west and south-west is a housing site (Bloor) which is currently being built out, with a track leading out on to Church Road. To the south-east and east agricultural land remains, with Allards Farm just beyond and vast areas of open country beyond that.
- 1.2 The site does not contain any constraints other than a series of Public Rights of Way.
- 1.3 The town of Stowmarket is approximately 1.8km to the west.
- 1.4 350 metres to the north is the Grade II* listed Columbine Hall whose formal grounds extend to Gipping Road.

2.0 The Proposal

- 2.1 The application seeks Outline Planning permission (All matters reserved) for the erection of up to 70 dwellings. With this an area of Public Open Space to the south will be provided, along with a smaller area to the north.

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.
- 3.3 Members will be aware that the above policies were recently criticised in the Woolpit public enquiry and should be given very limited weight.
- 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 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.
- 3.7 In this proposal a gross density of approximately 12.5 dwellings per hectare is proposed, rising to approximately 26.5 when looking at the developed area on its own. Being an edge of settlement/ fairly rural location, it is considered that the proposed density is suitable and appropriate in this location.
- 3.8 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.
- 3.9 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."
- 3.10 The proposed development falls within the Stowmarket Area Action Plan (SAAP) and it therefore needs to be considered in relation to SAAP Policy 11.1 relating to the delivery of infrastructure.
- 3.11 Relevant specifically to Stowupland is the emergence of the Neighbourhood Plan. This document has been evolving over the last three years. Members are advised that the proposed plan was submitted for inspection in the late autumn of 2018.
- 3.12 The Inspector has asked for further information, which is due in February. If the Inspector is content with the level of information and finds the Plan to be sound, then a referendum will be held amongst Stowupland's residents to see whether the document should then be adopted.
- 3.13 At the time of writing, this is a number of weeks, if not months away and at the moment the document can still be given no weight.

3.14 Saved Policies in the Local Plans

- 3.15 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.
- 3.16 The saved Local Plan through policies GP1, H13, H15, H16, 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.

3.17 The Principle of Development

- 3.18 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.

3.19 Sustainability

- 3.20 The site is within the A14 corridor, where a high level of growth is forecast and is immediately adjacent to the new eastern edge of Stowupland (which is currently being built) and is located within easy reach of some, but not the full suite of, facilities. Stowupland is a Key Service Centre. The Freeman Primary School is 350 metres to the south of the site, with the village hall slightly further and The Crown public house approximately 450 metres distant. The high school is just over 600 metres to the west. The co-op (also a petrol station) is approximately 850m metres off. All of these are on, or near to, the A1120 (Church Road). This road can be reached via a public right of way. There is then a hardened footway from the primary school, linking westward through to the other facilities. However, the 200 metre stretch from the footpath to the school is narrow.
- 3.21 There are alternative footpaths which avoid the A1120, but which would make the journey longer. Whilst these logically link through to the high school and some other facilities, they would be slightly circuitous for people accessing the primary school. In the latter case it is likely that some users would access Church Road in cars.
- 3.22 Whilst there are bus stops to take residents in to Stowmarket, the closest one appears to be opposite The Crown, so approximately 450 metres from the site. The buses run every two hours. Therefore, whilst there is some possibility of use, it does not seem to be a very user-friendly option.
- 3.23 The Nutshells Tea Room at the former Mr Allard's farm shop has recently re-opened, giving another local facility, however it is not clear how long-term a proposition this is.

- 3.24 Therefore, whilst non-car-borne access to some facilities is a very real possibility, it is also likely that there will be some dependence on car use to access some of these facilities. However, the balance is such that the scheme can be held to be environmentally sustainable overall.
- 3.25 The economic strand to sustainability sees the usual transient boost whilst the development is built out. In addition, a potential 200 plus residents would add spend to local concerns such as the Co-op or the tea room. It is accepted that the main spend by locals will be in Stowmarket or further afield, but these extra residents will contribute to the local economy.
- 3.26 Socially, the development physically borders (albeit separated by a landscape buffer) the Bloor development, but links through to it and the wider Stowupland housing stock via a series of footpaths. The new residents will call on the same services, such as schools, as existing residents. Given this, and the provision of affordable housing, the development is held to be socially inclusive and socially sustainable.

4.0 Site Access, Parking and Highway Safety Considerations

- 4.1 Permission for access is not being sought in this Outline application. Therefore, the full details of this are not for consideration here.
- 4.2 However, the application shows a proposed link through to the Bloor Homes site to the west (which then accesses Church Road).
- 4.3 The Highway Authority has stated that an access on to Gipping Road would not be acceptable, adding: "if this site is served off the A1120 via the existing approved site, and provides an emergency access, as shown on the indicative plan, it will comply with our requirement.."
- 4.4 This matter will be subject to a condition, to avoid a subsequent applicant (at Reserved Matters stage) applying for a different access.
- 4.5 The substantive issues of highway safety and efficiency are, therefore, satisfied.

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. Policies H13 and GP1 contain further commentary as to what is expected of developers in this regard.
- 5.2 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.
- 5.3 As the proposal is Outline (with only access being sought here), matters of layout and design are left to the Reserved Matters stage. However, it is beholden on the applicant to demonstrate that the desired quantum of development can be satisfactorily achieved.

- 5.4 Your Officers have negotiated changes from an original scheme in response to heritage matters which were raised and this is explored below in the heritage section.
- 5.5 Given that the scheme has no interface with any residences (the Bloor scheme which is being built out having a buffer between it and this site – a buffer which can be further secured by condition here) and given the relatively low density, there are no doubts that the desired quantum of development can be achieved. There is one existing residence to consider, and that is covered in the relevant section below.
- 5.6 It is proposed to have a condition in place that garaging should be used just for that purpose (and for storage of household items), so as to ensure garages are not converted, which could lead to nuisance parking on carriageways and footpaths.
- 5.7 Further, it is advised that the permission should carry an informative that triple parking will not be accepted at Reserved Matters stage.

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. There are, however, issues of the rural landscape in relation to heritage assets which require examination (below).
- 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 170 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 application was accompanied by an Ecological Scoping Survey which has made certain recommendations and Place Services have recommended that these measures be taken on board.

6.8 Overall, there are no outstanding concerns relating to landscape impact, trees, ecology, biodiversity or protected species.

7.0 Impact on Residential Amenity

7.1 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.

7.2 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.

7.3 As this Outline application seeks Access only, the height of buildings will be established at Reserved Matters. It is therefore not possible or necessary to assess potential overlooking or overshadowing in any detail. It is worth noting, however, that the neighbouring properties at the new Bloor development are sufficiently separated (and in any event front facing and separated from the site by access roads and planting) to not be affected in any meaningful way.

7.4 The one dwelling which could be negatively affected is the farmhouse on Gipping Road which is the only dwelling with a boundary to the site. The north-west corner of the site is currently shown to have a LAP (Local Area of Play) and some landscaping which would act as a buffer to the development as seen from the farmhouse.

7.5 The current open aspect from that property would be lost, this is noted but is not a material consideration. Provided the privacy of that dwelling can be maintained (which will be achieved with a landscaping condition) then matters of residential amenity are satisfied.

7.6 The other aspect is the build phase. Whilst there are few residences in the vicinity, a Construction Management Plan is advised, which would ensure sociable hours of working and so on.

8.0 Heritage Matters

8.1 A number of parties have raised concerns over the visual impact of the development on the setting of the Grade II* listed Columbine Hall and its grounds. In response to this, the applicant submitted an amended indicative layout (Rev G) on 26th November 2018. This sought to address the concerns of Historic England by increasing the POS and landscape buffer to the north. This will assist in not so readily reading the development in the setting of the heritage asset.

- 8.2 Paragraph 196 of the NPPF states that “where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset this harm should be weighed against the public benefit of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.”
- 8.3 The above paragraph does appear to be more relevant to the buildings themselves, their curtilages and their immediate settings, more than what Historic England (HE) has described as their “wider setting.” The identified harm is to the perceived erosion of the wider rural setting of a building 200 metres distant.
- 8.4 HE made it clear that it did not object to the principle of developing the field and suggested an improvement (i.e. widening the planting belt to the north) which has been accepted by the applicant.
- 8.5 Given the less than substantial harm, given this amendment and given the fact that the setting of Columbine Hall has been preserved thanks to this planting belt (thus optimising its use in the context of preserving the rural setting of the Hall), the heritage issue is held to be satisfied.
- 8.6 Members are reminded that the application is in outline, but it would be prudent to carry a condition at this stage that the above-mentioned buffer be in broad compliance with the submitted drawings.

9.0 Other Matters

- 9.1 Stowupland Parish Council has requested that the proposed Public Open Space be transferred to it. The area, known as Thradstone’s Meadow is of local importance and has long been enjoyed as a hay meadow. The parish wishes to retain it for its traditional use, rather than it being mown and manicured and used for an area of formal recreation.
- 9.2 The applicant has agreed to this transfer and this shall be written in to a legal agreement, together with a maintenance sum.

PART FOUR – CONCLUSION

10.0 Planning Balance and Conclusion

- 10.1 The site in question is not allocated, but the lack of a five-year housing supply is a serious material consideration.
- 10.2 The site is contiguous with the newly-expanded Stowupland and is reasonably well connected to some, if not all, facilities and services and is held to be reasonably sustainable environmentally, economically and socially.

- 10.3 There are no concerns in terms of Highway safety and efficiency or ecology and, whilst concerns about the effect on the historic rural landscape and heritage assets have been raised, these have now been addressed.
- 10.4 Given the proposed density, the separation from existing dwellings and the proposed buffer to ensure residential amenity, the quantum of development sought is achievable, whilst ensuring adequate garden size and parking provision.
- 10.5 The proposal also offers affordable housing, which will help towards the Council's objectives regarding affordable provision.
- 10.6 Approval is, therefore, recommended.

11.0 RECOMMENDATION

(1) That subject to an acceptable drainage scheme being provided to the satisfaction of the Local Lead Flood Authority, that authority be delegated to the Acting Chief Planning Officer to grant planning permission, subject to the prior completion of a Section 106 or Undertaking on terms to their satisfaction to secure the following heads of terms:

- Affordable Housing
- Transfer of Open Space plus maintenance sum.

(2) and that such permission is subject to conditions including:

- Approved Plan showing indicative layout and access
- No access on to Church Road.
- Emergency access to be provided as shown
- Travel packs to be provided as shown
- Refuse/bin-store details to be provided concurrent with Reserved Matters
- Details of manoeuvring/parking/cycle storage to be provided with Reserved Matters
- Details of water discharge
- Extra conditions as may be requested by Floods team
- Details of roads/gradients etc. concurrent with Reserved Matters
- Roads/paths to binder level prior to occupation
- Unexpected contamination
- Landscaping scheme to be submitted concurrent with Reserved Matters
- Boundary treatment with Reserved Matters
- Archaeology
- Compliance with tree plan
- Detailed Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan with Reserved Matters
- Fire hydrants
- Sustainability measures
- Construction and Delivery method statement
- Garages to be used only for parking of vehicles/storage of household items
- Works to comply with ecological enhancements

And Informatives including:

- Triple parking will not be tolerated at Reserved Matters stage.
- Standard advisory for Anglian Water
- Standard advisory for highway works
- Standard advisory for footpaths

3) That in the event of the Planning Obligation referred to in Resolution (1) above not being secured, or if an acceptable drainage scheme is not submitted that the Corporate Manager- Planning for Growth be authorised to refuse planning permission on appropriate grounds.