

With reference to paragraph 3.5 on page 11, the following text should supersede:

**The NPPF requires Councils to identify and update, on an annual basis, a supply of specific deliverable sites to provide for 5 years' housing provision against identified requirements (see paragraph 73). For sites to be considered deliverable they have to be available, suitable, achievable and viable. The Council recently published a Housing Land Supply Position Statement which identifies the Council can demonstrate a sufficient land supply (5.67 years). The District is able to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. As such, the 'tilted balance' as set out under Paragraph 11(d) is not engaged.**

With reference to paragraph 3.9 on page 11, and paragraph 3.10 on page 34, the wording *"In the absence of a five-year housing land supply this weighting is reduced further to some degree"* should be deleted.

With reference to the Section 15 (Planning Balance) of the report, the following text should supersede:

#### **DC/19/02315 - LAND SOUTH OF HIGH BANK, MELFORD ROAD, SUDBURY, SUFFOLK**

##### **Planning Balance**

The Council benefits from a five-year housing land supply. The starting point for decision-taking purposes remains firmly with the Development Plan with the NPPF a material consideration in this decision. Development Plan policies generally conform with the aims of the NPPF to promote sustainable transport through walking, cycling and public transport by actively managing patterns of growth in support of this, whereby significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. In that respect the development complies with CS1, the broader thrust of CS2 (notwithstanding its exceptional circumstances "test"), and CS15. Whilst the policy conflict with CS2 is noted, this is not considered to be a matter on which this application turns.

The NPPF objectives for sustainable development include delivering a sufficient supply of homes. The Council can currently demonstrate a five-year land supply position as required by paragraph 73 of the NPPF, with 5.67 years. Whilst the 'tilted balance' as set out under Paragraph 11(d) is not engaged, for the reasons set out in this report this does not alter the recommendation made.

The NPPF requires decisions to be approved that accords with an up to date development plan without delay. The proposal accords with the 'most important' policies, is in a sustainable location, within walking distance of a good range of local services, adjoining the settlement boundary.

The NPPF and Policy CS1 require development to be approved that accords with an up to date development plan, and without delay.

The proposal accords with the 'most important' policies applicable to the proposal, is in a sustainable location, within walking distance of a good range of local services. The proposed development is visually well related to the area, adjoining the settlement boundary, offering betterment and uplift through choice design and layout which effectively utilises the undeveloped site.

In recognition of CN06, Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, and finally Paragraphs 193 – 197 of the NPPF, the scheme does create a degree of harm from a heritage perspective. In 'weighing up' the public benefits of the scheme against the 'medium level'

harm caused by development, the balance would fall in favour of approval owing to; effective use of land, ecology enhancement, landscape improvement, sustainable location and housing units (including affordable provision).

In determining this application Officers are mindful of the specific duty imposed on the local planning authority with respect to the need to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting, as set out in section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Full consideration has been given to the comments received from the Heritage Team. The level of harm to the above heritage assets is noted to be a medium level of less than substantial harm.

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 benefits of the proposal. In consideration of the contribution towards the Council's housing targets, provision of housing, affordable housing and the sustainable location, it is considered that these material considerations would none the less outweigh the medium level of less than substantial harm to the heritage assets, even where a considerable importance and great weight is applied to the desire to keep the affected asset from harm.

Officers have therefore applied the balance required by paragraph 196 of the NPPF, having special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of the listed building as required by section 66 of the listed buildings Act and given the harm considerable importance and weight. The outcome of this balancing exercise is that those public benefits identified outweigh the medium level of less than substantial harm, having given considerable importance and weight to the harm identified.

The design ethos is welcomed, and given the proposed conditions set out, the scheme could be sensitively finished in appropriate materials which would soften the immediate impact of development. Officers are of the sound opinion that a tonally acceptable appearance could be generated, with the overriding public benefits cited.

There is little before Officers to suggest the scheme conflicts to an unacceptable level in terms of; design and layout, heritage, residential amenity, landscape, ecology, highways, flood and water, land contamination or sustainability. These key outcomes are appropriately safeguarded, and conditioned / legally bound where justified.

The proposal represents an appropriate proposal for residential development and would deliver sustainable development, furthering the overarching thrust of Policies CS1, CS2, and CS15 of the Core Strategy, and providing net gains to the three objectives of sustainability in accordance with the NPPF (which notwithstanding the Development Plan is a compelling material consideration). The above harms identified relating to heritage and conflict with policy CS2 and CS19 are considered to be outweighed by the benefits of the proposal, namely the additional dwellings, affordable dwelling provided and the sustainable location of the site. The application is therefore recommended for approval.