

## **Committee Report**

**Item No: 1**

**Reference:** DC/18/03547

**Case Officer:** Alex Scott

**Ward:** Thurston & Hesselton.

**Ward Member/s:** Cllr Derrick Haley. Cllr Esther Jewson.

---

## **RECOMMENDATION – APPROVE RESERVED MATTERS WITH CONDITIONS**

---

### **Description of Development**

Application for approval of Reserved Matters following Outline Planning Permission Town & Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 – Layout, Scale, Appearance and Landscaping pursuant to condition 3 of Outline Planning Permission 4963/16, for up to 250 dwellings, open space and associated infrastructure.

### **Location**

Land To The West Of , Ixworth Road, Thurston

**Parish:** Thurston

**Expiry Date:** 29/03/2019

**Application Type:** RES - Reserved Matters

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

**Applicant:** Persimmon Homes (Suffolk)

**Agent:** Mr D Cogman

---

## **PART ONE – REASON FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE**

---

The application is referred to committee for the following reason/s:

It is a “Major” application for:

- 15 or more dwellings

### **Details of Previous Committee / Resolutions and any member site visit**

Members visited Thurston on the 13th June 2017 to look at this site and the four other residential development schemes that were being considered by the Council at that time.

Outline Planning Application (Ref: 4963/16) for up to 250 new dwellings, open space and associated infrastructure, up to 4.4Ha of land for educational uses for Thurston Community College, and a new Primary School site, including details of access on land west of Ixworth Road was considered and approved by Development Committee (Subject to S106 and Conditions) on 1<sup>st</sup> November 2017.

This reserved matters application (Ref: DC/18/03547) was previously considered at the Development Committee Meeting on the 27<sup>th</sup> March 2019. Members resolved to be minded to Refuse the application at this time on the basis of the following:-

- Poor design and layout
- Inappropriate scale and mix of development, including 2.5 storey (or 3 storey) development
- Fails to respond to local character and local distinctiveness and neither conserves or enhances the area
- Contrary to NPPF 127 and 130 and Core Strategy FC1.1

Suggestions from members to note included need for more Bungalow development, more hipped roofs and it was asked if a cycle route can be reviewed if possible.

**Has a Committee Call In request been received from a Council Member?**

No

**Details of Pre-Application Advice**

The applicant engaged with the Council and received pre-application advice on the principle of the development and its acceptability having regards to the fact that the Council does not have a 5 year supply of housing in 2017.

With regards the current Reserved Matters Application: The applicant again engaged with the Council and pre-application advice with regards reserved matters was given in April 2018.

---

**PART TWO – POLICIES AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY**

---

**Summary of Policies**

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework  
FC01 - Presumption In Favour Of Sustainable Development  
FC01\_1 - Mid Suffolk Approach To Delivering Sustainable Development  
CS05 - Mid Suffolk's Environment  
CS06 - Services and Infrastructure  
CS09 - Density and Mix  
GP01 - Design and layout of development  
HB01 - Protection of historic buildings  
HB13 - Protecting Ancient Monuments  
HB14 - Ensuring archaeological remains are not destroyed  
H13 - Design and layout of housing development  
H15 - Development to reflect local characteristics  
H16 - Protecting existing residential amenity  
H17 - Keeping residential development away from pollution  
CL08 - Protecting wildlife habitats  
T09 - Parking Standards  
T10 - Highway Considerations in Development  
RT04 - Amenity open space and play areas within residential development  
RT12 - Footpaths and Bridleways  
SB03 - Retaining visually important open spaces

## **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**

#### **Thurston Parish Council**

Continues to OBJECT to the application, on the basis of the latest revisions : A very late engagement process with the PC was carried out by Persimmon Homes and no opportunity for constructive discussions were given prior to submission; Urban feel to design which neither complements or enhances the village; PC would like to see more Bungalows delivered on site; given the demography of the village; Would like to see more structural 8-10 metres landscaping buffer to the northern boundary; Wish to see more tree planting internal to the site, note that less trees are now proposed than as originally indicated; Concern that the latest scheme has removed a lot of parking from the frontages of the proposed dwellings, concern that this will result in more on-street parking; Do not wish to see parking in courtyards to the rear of properties; Concern with the amount of garages proposed and do not consider they should be counted as parking spaces; Seeks reassurance that suitable play equipment will be delivered on site (LAP or LEAP, Play equipment for the over 12's, and a Gym Trail); Concern that no provision has been made for Footpath and Cycle-path connection to the Village Centre as previously promised by Persimmon.

#### **SCC - Highways**

No objection - Subject to compliance with suggested conditions - The latest planning layout supplied for this application is acceptable in terms of highway safety. There are a number of minor highway design changes required for the site but these can be addressed during the Section 38 agreement with the SCC as the Highway Authority.

#### **Highways England**

The latest scheme is unlikely to have any further impact on the strategic road network.

#### **MSDC - Environmental Health - Land Contamination**

No comments to make with regards impacts associated with Land Contamination.

#### **MSDC - Environmental Health - Noise/Odour/Light/Smoke**

No objection to the proposed development - Subject to agreed construction management.

#### **MSDC - Environmental Health - Air Quality**

Confirm that Environmental Health have no comments to make with regards Air Quality impacts arising from the development.

#### **MSDC - Environmental Health - Sustainability Issues**

The information received to date does not address sustainability issues therefore we have no comment.

#### **SCC - Flood & Water Management**

Holding objection is because the applicant has still not supplied sufficient detail of the landscaping of the SuDs features, specifically the attenuation lagoon. The planting of the lagoon should be done in a manner that support and encourages local species. The point below detail the action required in order to overcome our current objection:-

1. Detail landscaping design and planting details of the of SuDs features (cross and long sections, including specific planting details).

#### **Anglian Water**

The reserved matters does not relate to matters relevant to Anglian Water so we will not be providing comments at this time.

### **MSDC - Strategic Housing (Affordable/Major Dwell/G+T)**

87 Affordable units (35% of total) should be provided on site comprising 53 affordable rent units, 24 shared ownership units and 10 starter home units.

Concern that most of the proposed affordable dwellings are too small:

- The 1 bed homes should be 58 sqm and not 50.9 sqm as proposed
- The 2 bed homes should be 79 sqm and not 70.7 sqm as proposed
- The 3 bed homes should be 93 sqm and not 81 and 70.7 sqm as proposed

Note that the proposed 69.95 sqm of floorspace for the affordable 2 bed flats is acceptable.

Comments with regards MARKET DWELLINGS proposed : The property mix for the open market dwellings are all houses, and mainly 3, 4 and 5 bed houses, with 21 of these as 5 bed houses. There are 19 x 2 bed houses which is to be welcomed but we really needed to see some 2 and 3 bed bungalows on this site to offer some housing choices to older people seeking level access housing and accommodation to down-size to. The principle of development has already been agreed but the range of available dwellings to meet the needs of our demographic profile in the district and specifically Thurston is lacking.

### **Ecology - Place Services**

It is recommended that further ecological enhancements are required for this application and it advised that the details of these enhancements should include the following: a) Purpose and conservation objectives for the proposed enhancement measures; b) detailed designs to achieve stated objectives; c) locations of proposed enhancement measures by appropriate maps and plans; d) timetable for implementation demonstrating that works are aligned with the proposed phasing of development; e) persons responsible for implementing the enhancement measures; f) details of initial aftercare and long-term maintenance (where relevant). Consider it would be beneficial to have details of the planting scheme to ensure that appropriate plant species have been recommended within the landscape design.

### **Landscape - Place Services**

Recommend conditions in the event that approval of this application is forthcoming.

### **Suffolk Wildlife Trust**

#### Ecological Enhancements

Planning permission 4963/16 included condition 7 which secured the provision of ecological enhancements on the site, in line with the recommendations made in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) report (Enims, March 2016). However, the current reserved matters application does not appear to include details of how or where these enhancement measures will be incorporated into the development. We recommend that a plan is provided detailing the locations of the ecological enhancements, along with a timetable for their provision.

In addition to the measures identified in the original PEA, we also recommend that ecological enhancement measures for the site include integrated nesting boxes for swifts and hedgehog friendly garden boundaries. Swift nesting opportunities can be included through the use of swift nest bricks built into suitable building elevations. Hedgehog friendly garden boundaries can be achieved either by creating 13cm by 13cm holes in the bases of fences and walls, or by using soft landscaping boundaries.

#### Landscaping Proposals

The proposed development offers the opportunity to create new green corridors, however the Landscaping Masterplan (drawing ref. JBA 16/053-03) provided appears to include little in the way of

such provision. In particular, the opportunity to create a green corridor along the western side of the site, linking the proposed attenuation area and public open space to the wider countryside has been missed. Whilst we acknowledge that the broad amount of housing to be developed on the site has been set through the Outline planning consent, we recommend that the overall landscaping plan is revisited to ensure that opportunities to create meaningful green corridors through the site are maximised. Such green corridors would also complement the ecological enhancements identified above.

**SCC - Rights Of Way Department**

No objection - Developer should be made aware of their rights and responsibilities regarding the public right of way which runs through the site.

**Historic England**

Do not wish to offer any comments on the basis of the information provided - Suggest the LPA seek the views of specialist conservation and archaeological advisers, as relevant.

**SCC - Archaeological Service**

Archaeological evaluation and mitigation has now been completed, with no further on site work to be completed - No longer have any objection to the RM application being granted.

**NHS England (50+ Dwellings/C2/Care Or Nursing Homes)**

There are No GP practices within a 2km radius of the proposed development, there is a GP practice closest to the proposed development and this is within circa 5km. This practice does have sufficient capacity for the additional growth resulting from this development but cumulative development growth in the area would see a need to expand the current practice. Therefore a developer contribution, via CIL processes, towards the capital funding to increase capacity within the GP Catchment Area would be sought to mitigate the impact.

**SCC - Strategic Development Contributions Manager**

No objection subject to the existing planning obligation (attached to outline permission ref: 4963/16) dated 09 July 2018 remains in place. For information, Suffolk County Council holds an option agreement for up to 4.4 hectares of land identified for education use which was included as part of the outline planning permission under reference 4963/16.

**St. Edmundsbury Borough Council**

St Edmundsbury Borough Council has no comments to make on this Reserved Matters application.

**SCC - Travel Plan Co-ordinator**

No comment to make at this stage.

**MSDC - Planning Policy - Contrary To Dev Plan/Departures**

Do not wish to make comment.

**MSDC - Heritage Team**

Heritage does not wish to offer comment on this application.

**The Environment Agency**

Do not wish to make comment - Standard checklist provided.

**Natural England**

Do not wish to make comment.

**MSDC - Arboricultural Officer**

No comments received.

### **Suffolk Police - Design Out Crime Officers**

No comments received.

### **Network Rail**

No comments received.

### **Asset Utilisation**

No comments received.

### **SCC - Fire & Rescue**

No comments received.

## **B: Representations**

### **Suffolk Preservation Society (Lavenham)**

Suffolk Preservation Society is deeply concerned for the village by these proposals which are fundamentally of a very poor quality. Designs appear to be focussed on maximising densities and characterised by excessive standardisation, at the expense of true place-making. This is one of the first of a number of proposed growth sites in Thurston and it is therefore crucial to set a benchmark for high quality, responsive design. We would not wish to see a precedent set for generic, standardised volume housing which fails to contribute positively to the village and its setting. The Society strongly suggests that the application is either refused or withdrawn and a wholly different design approach pursued. It is important the local planning authority stand firm, as even in this current planning climate, it is highly likely any appeal involving such a design would be dismissed based on widespread policy conflict.

Key concerns relate to the lack of creative and contextualised design process, car parking dominance, inadequate walking and cycling consideration, roads and parking dictating the shape of streets and spaces rather than buildings, could-be-anywhere house and street types, absence of townscape features, compromised liveability standards and poorly integrated affordable housing.

While we welcome the promise of green infrastructure permeating through development this does not translate well at the detailed level.

### **Third Party**

Letters of concern or objection have been received from 8 no. third party sources during the course of consideration. Comments received are summarised below:

- Proposal has increased from 50 dwellings, per the draft neighbourhood plan to 250 dwellings. The proposal, therefore, represents Overdevelopment;
- The urban scheme with regimented layout, to achieve maximum density of housing, is not compatible with the rural environment;
- Do not consider the proposed density and design of housing is sensitive and compatible with the existing rural environment and existing properties fronting Mill Lane;
- Consider proposed designs lack imagination and are inappropriate;
- The PROW which traverses the site will be adversely affected by reason of loss of open space and amenity enjoyed by walkers;
- Do not wish to see further roads and accesses crossing the PROW, in the interest of pedestrian safety, character and amenity;

- The proposed public open space is woefully inadequate, divided by roads, not linked up into a more usable space and raises concerns with regards pedestrian safety, and child safety in particular;
- The proposal and loss of vegetation along Ixworth Road will change the character of the road from country road to a busy thoroughfare;
- Walkers will have to cross the road from the site and existing footpaths which could present pedestrian safety concerns at peak times, because of increased traffic on Ixworth Road;
- Concern that only one access point is proposed from the development consider this would result in gridlock at peak times;
- There is no Street Lighting proposed, which is a safety issue;
- Concern with regards any proposal for street lighting and the resultant light pollution that would result;
- There is no landscape buffer as indicated at outline stage, which would transition to the Countryside and provide wildlife habitat;
- Consider more landscape buffering is required, particularly to the northern boundary of the site and to the western boundary, adjacent to existing properties fronting Mill Lane;
- Concern with regards potential overlooking, loss of privacy, loss of daylight and impact on noise amenity for existing properties along Mill Lane;
- Concern with regards proposed emergency access to Mill Lane, which is a single Track Road with no provision for vehicles to pass on the highway - Concern with regards road safety on Mill Lane;
- The proposal shows no boundary buffer zone between the rear boundaries and gardens of existing properties fronting Mill Lane - Concern with regards loss of privacy due to proximity of dwellings and differing land levels;
- Request a condition regarding precise details with regards boundary treatments along the rear boundaries of dwellings fronting Mill Lane, consider that if fences are proposed then this would be unsympathetic and harmful;
- The proposal lacks provision for the elderly and only 4 Bungalows are proposed - allege Persimmon seem reluctant to embrace the concept of single-storey living;
- Concern that Persimmon are reluctant to provide dwellings with floor areas as required by national space standards and the Council's Housing Officers;
- Consider more Bungalows are required, ideally all along the boundary with existing properties fronting Mill Lane which would address both need and neighbouring amenity issues;
- Consider other schemes in Thurston have provided better landscaping, better layouts and more bungalows - consistency is required by way of this proposal;
- The concern of residents and the Suffolk Preservation Society with regards housing density, character, design, landscaping and impact on rural character have been ignored, this is despite other developers within the village adopting a more considerate approach;
- Maintain concerns with regards road drainage in Relation to Ixworth Road - do not consider these have been satisfactorily addressed;
- Raise concern with regards Persimmon development at Mount Pleasant, Framlingham where dwellings were built differently to what was approved and better quality dwellings were replaced with bland, basic designs - consider this makes a mockery of the planning system - consider that Persimmon cannot be trusted to build what has been approved - consider Persimmon seem to have a very dismissive attitude to Councils, planners and residents; consider there are better house builders to do business with;
- Consider Persimmon are seeking to maximise profit by sticking to 250 dwellings

## **PLANNING HISTORY**

**REF:** 4963/16

Outline Planning Application for up to 250 new dwellings, open space and associated infrastructure, up to 4.4Ha of land for educational uses for Thurston Community College, and a new Primary School site, including details of access on land west of Ixworth Road.

**DECISION:** GTD

---

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

---

### **1. The Site and Surroundings**

- 1.1. The application site lies in the village of Thurston which has a population of approximately 3200 people (2011 census). The site extends to an area of 13.7 hectares of grade 2 agricultural land which is generally flat but falls away gently towards its northern point and towards the dwellings that lie on Barton Road and Mill Lane. Ixworth Road is a typical country road without pavements and street lighting as it extends out into the countryside. Barton Road to the west of the site is bordered by existing residential properties, with Mill Lane which directly borders the site being a narrow country lane with limited and low density residential development on it.
- 1.2. As the site is currently in agricultural use, tree cover is limited to sporadic trees on the Ixworth Road boundary, dense hedging between the site and the school playing fields of the College, and a line of sporadic trees between the site and the properties on Barton Road. The tree/hedge cover becomes denser between the site and Mill Lane, but it does not completely screen it.
- 1.3. Adjacent to the most northern part of the site in the east lies the Thurston Rugby club, but otherwise the land is open countryside characterised by agricultural practices. A public footpath also crosses the field running west/east directly through the middle of the site.
- 1.4. Directly to the south of the site lies the school playing fields belonging to the college and this parcel of land is designated as a visually important open space in the Mid Suffolk Local Plan. The settlement boundary for Thurston runs between the school playing field and the designated land and, as such, this proposal does not abut the settlement boundary for Thurston and remains as countryside for planning purposes.

### **2. The Proposal**

- 2.1. The application is submitted further to outline planning permission ref: 4963/16, granted in July 2018, and seeks approval of reserved matters relating to the Layout, Scale, Appearance and Landscaping of 250 new dwellings.
- 2.2. The application proposes delivery of 163 market housing units and 87 affordable housing units, as well as well as approximately 1.2 hectares of Public Open Space, play equipment, and an attenuation Lagoon (measuring approximately 0.58 hectares). The existing Public Right of Way (PF10) which traverses the site is proposed to be retained, surfaced with Hoggin and boarded by public open space, crossed by a road at only one point.

2.3. Amended and additional details were received from the applicant following the committee meeting on the 27<sup>th</sup> March 2019. Amended and additional information received is summarised as follows:-

- 4 no. additional Bungalows, adjacent to those initially proposed, to the rear of existing dwellings fronting Mill Lane;
- 2.5 Storey (or 3 Storey) dwellings removed from Character Area 2, along the northern site boundary;
- 9 no. Hipped roofed dwellings added (Hadleigh and Chedworth Character);
- 16 no. other House type changes;
- 2 metre wide Hoggin Path added, along the route of the PROW;
- Teen Play Equipment Added;
- Fence added to the rear of dwellings fronting Mill Lane and wildlife corridor defined.

2.4. The proposed density of housing development would be approximately 21 dwelling per hectare, with back to back distances of no less than 20 metres.

2.5. The proposed dwelling heights are broken down as follows:

**Market Dwellings**

Single Storey (Bungalows)	=	8 no.
Two Storey	=	120 no.
2.5 Storey (3 <sup>rd</sup> storey in roof-space)	=	35 no.

**Affordable Dwellings**

Two Storey Dwellings	=	83 no.
Two Storey Flats Building	=	1 no. (Containing 4 no. Flats)

2.6. The proposed bedroom numbers are broken down as follows:

**Market Dwellings**

1 Bedroom	=	0 no.	
2 Bedroom	=	24 no.	
3 Bedroom	=	87 no.	(NB. 38 no. are proposed as 2 Bed with a first floor 'Study')
4 Bedroom	=	34 no.	(NB. 11 no. are proposed as 3 Bed with a first floor 'Study')
5 Bedroom	=	18 no.	(NB. 18 no. are proposed as 4 Bed with a first floor 'Study')

**Affordable Dwellings**

1 Bedroom	=	12 no.
2 Bedroom	=	60 no.
3 Bedroom	=	15 no.

**3. The Principle Of Development**

3.1. The development is outside the settlement boundary but granted outline planning permission and this is the submission of reserved matters. While there are objections and comments on principle issues, these have been dealt with under the outline granted. The issues of Layout, Scale, Appearance and Landscaping only are for consideration.

**4. Site Access, Parking And Highway Safety Considerations**

4.1. Access details and connections to the site have been dealt with under the outline permission. The outline permission also establishes the principle of 250 dwellings and related traffic to and from

the site. Parking and visitor parking meet the requirements under the SCC Parking Standards. The parking proposals are as follows: -

439 allocated parking spaces  
81 Single Garages (detached and integral) (1 parking space)  
5 Double Garages (2 parking spaces)  
39 Visitor/Informal off road parking bays

- 4.2. SCC Highways agree the parking provision meets the minimum requirement for parking places as shown in the Suffolk Parking for Guidance 2015.
- 4.3. Tandem parking has been raised previously as a concern and it is understood SCC Highways may be changing policy in 2019 in respect of this matter, but currently the adopted guidance states the following in full:-  
*“Tandem parking (one vehicle behind the other) is acceptable on-plot, within the curtilage of a dwelling but should be discouraged in areas which offer general access, e.g. parking courts. The provision of tandem parking reduces the uptake of spaces, often used instead for bin storage in rear parking courts, and their provision encourages on-street parking. Allowance must be made for vehicle manoeuvring, in terms of space and highway safety, if tandem parking is proposed.”*
- 4.4. SCC’s previous concern related to instances where three spaces in tandem occur (with or without a garage included) and the potential impact on main roads through a development as occupiers may need to shuffle their cars around or choose instead to park more on the main road and avoid shuffling cars. Where garage design historically precluded parking of vehicles and storage of domestic items such as bicycles, lawnmowers etc some displacement of vehicles was not unusual. The current garage design standards are intended to allow for both and overcome this problem.
- 4.5. Your officers have reviewed all comparable cases in 2017/2018 and their treatment of tandem parking. There have been a number of major housing schemes in the last few years, for example in Stowmarket, Thurston and Great Blakenham that have been approved by both Mid Suffolk committees and most of these have a degree of tandem parking. An average of 20% of the dwellings in major schemes approved in the last two years have tandem parking in the form of three spaces (whether in garage or not) in front of each other. Until very recently this has not been considered an issue as current guidance and policy does not restrict such proposals and only discourages this in certain instances. There are also benefits of tandem parking as it reduces how car dominated design by for example, avoiding wide driveways, to consider alongside drawbacks. With consideration of views given by members at recent committee meetings the applicant in this case has sought to minimise tandem parking on the site to 10% and those remaining areas where tandem parking takes place would predominantly be on cul de sac roads. In conclusion the final layout proposed ensures a safer layout with reduced tandem spaces and traffic calming measures now integrated with the proposal.
- 4.6. Your Officer and SCC Highways had previously considered that previous layout proposals were overly car dominated, particularly in areas fronting the principle estate road, in close proximity to the main access and that there would be a lot of cars potentially reversing straight out onto the main highway, with no provision to turn within property curtilages. It is considered that the final layout satisfactorily addresses these issues by reducing the number of parking spaces directly fronting the principle highway and, although this has required the addition of 1 no. rear parking court (usually not favoured), pedestrian permeability through this area is considered to make this the preferred parking solution in this instance.

- 4.7. In conclusion, the provision of 250 dwellings and access points have been agreed under the outline permission. Detailed road alignment in addition to the level and location of all parking is acceptable in policy terms. The changes during the course of the application have created a spacious and cul de sac based layout with access to significant open green space. The application proposal has no objection from SCC Highways and the applicant has addressed all concerns by making important and substantial changes to the layout. It is considered that the latest scheme before you is the result of beneficial amendments and improvements to the proposal.

## **5. Design And Layout [Impact On Street Scene]**

- 5.1. The development is predominantly two-storey with 14% (35 no.) being 2.5 storey and 3.2% (8 no.) being single-storey (Bungalows). The layout has been discussed above in part, but is essentially a network of cul de sac roads spurring off a principle spine road, which loops through the centre of the development linked to public open space to create a welcoming, quality, pedestrian-friendly residential environment. Back gardens meet back gardens and avoid unsupervised spaces. The new dwellings will be set back from the Ixworth Road frontage to include a green corridor to accord with landscaping recommendations, as well as creating a softer frontage, more in keeping with the existing rural character. The proposed frontage is also pedestrian friendly with the new footpath proposed to the south of the approved access, linking into the existing PROW network and a potential continuous footpath link to the Village centre in future.
- 5.2. The layout proposes a wide range of house types, with 50 total variations split into three distinct character groups. Whilst the majority of designs are taken from the developer's generic catalogue several designs (Including the fully rendered properties and Bungalows) are bespoke to the application. The designs of the dwellings have been developed numerous times throughout the application process. The resulting range of house types now enjoy detailed features with a greater range of material variances and combinations when compared to an average larger estate. It is considered that the proposals will provide a development of sufficient interest and individual character.
- 5.3. The issue of proposed dwellings not being in accordance with national space standards has been raised by your Strategic Housing Officers and by members of the public. Your officers have considered these concerns and advise that there are no existing development plan policies which specify dwelling space standards and the proposal is, therefore not contrary to the provisions of the plan in this respect. It is also considered that the internal floor areas proposed by the applicant are within acceptable tolerances, when compared to the national space standards.

## **6. Landscape Impact, Trees, Ecology, Biodiversity And Protected Species**

- 6.1. A landscape masterplan has been provided with the application, which proposes a number of new trees throughout the development site and new hedgerows and trees to site boundaries. Further detail, with regards planting species and number of planting rows will be submitted by the applicant at a later date, in accordance with Condition 4 (Landscape Scheme) of the outline planning permission.
- 6.2. The Parish Council, Specialist Consultees and members of the public have commented raising concern with regards the lack of landscaping detail submitted, in the interest of landscape character and quality and biodiversity. Of particular concern is the lack of structural planting shown to the northern boundary, adjacent to open countryside and the lack of detail with regards the landscaping of the western site boundary, adjacent to the existing rear garden boundaries of properties fronting Mill Lane, wherein also it has been recommended that an additional soft

landscape buffer zone is provided in the interest of providing a green wildlife corridor and in the interest of the amenity of neighbouring occupants. The applicant has been consulted with regards these issues and is accepting of a further condition, in the interest of securing landscape improvements, should permission be granted.

## **7. Impact On Residential Amenity**

- 7.1. Policy H13 of the development plan seeks to ensure new housing development protects the amenity of neighbouring residents. Policy H16 of the development plan seeks to protect the existing amenity of residential areas.
- 7.2. Paragraph 127 of the NPPF sets out a number of core planning principles as to underpin decision-taking, including, seeking to secure a high standard of amenity for existing and future users of developments and places.
- 7.3. The indicative layout demonstrates the site is readily capable of accommodating the proposed number of dwellings in a manner that will not unduly compromise the residential amenity of future occupiers of the development or occupiers of neighbouring dwellings. The proposed dwellings give no rise to unacceptable amenity impacts, owing largely to the separation distances between proposed dwellings and existing neighbouring dwellings.
- 7.4. With particular regard for the amenities of existing dwellings fronting Mill Lane, having considered the proposed separation distances of approximately 22 metres between existing and proposed dwellings, and having considered that single storey dwellings are proposed along the entire length of this boundary, the proposal is not considered to result in significant harm to the amenities currently enjoyed by occupants of these properties to consider refusal of the application on such grounds.
- 7.5. The proposal, therefore, accords with the aspirations of development plan policies H13 and H16 and with paragraph 127 of the NPPF in this regard.

---

## **PART FOUR – CONCLUSION**

---

### **8. Planning Balance and Conclusion**

- 8.1. The principle of development has been agreed for the number of dwellings proposed as well as the access arrangements. The resultant development provides an environment that is not car dominated, has good supervision and details a variety of dwelling styles and materials that provides interest to a range of streetscapes. All statutory consultees offer no significant objection to the scheme that cannot be addressed by way of existing or further conditions. The proposals are well connected to a number of existing public rights of way, will create a new landscaped edge to the village and provide an open space asset for the community to benefit from.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

That authority be delegated to the Acting Chief Planning Officer - Growth & Sustainable Planning to Grant reserved matters approval subject to the following conditions:

- Approved Plans and Documents

- Detailed scheme of Soft Landscape Planting (In addition to that already imposed as part of Outline Planning Permission Ref: 4963/16)
- Those required by SCC-Highways
- Those already imposed as part of Outline Planning Permission Ref: 4963/16