

Committee Report

Item 6C

Reference: DC/18/05613

Case Officer: Samantha Summers

Ward: Copdock & Washbrook.

Ward Member/s: Cllr David Busby.

RECOMMENDATION – GRANTPLANNING PERMISSION WITH CONDITIONS

Description of Development

Full Planning Application - Residential Development - Erection of 14 No Dwellings, garages and additional parking.

Location

Land to The East Of, Duke Street, Hintlesham, Suffolk

Expiry Date: 20/12/2019

Application Type: FUL - Full Planning Application

Development Type: Major Small Scale - Dwellings

Applicant: Williams Homes & Developments Ltd

Agent: Wincer Kievenaar Architects Limited

Parish: Hintlesham

Site Area: 0.9 hectares

Density of Development:

Details of Previous Committee / Resolutions and any member site visit: None

Has a Committee Call In request been received from a Council Member (Appendix 1): No

Has the application been subject to Pre-Application Advice: No

PART ONE – REASON FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE

The application is referred to committee for the following reason:

The Chief Planning Officer considers the application to be of a controversial nature having regard to the planning reasoning expressed by the Parish Council and the extent and planning substance of comments received from third parties.

PART TWO – POLICIES AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Summary of Policies

Babergh Core Strategy 2014:

- CS1 Applying the Presumption in favour of sustainable development in Babergh
- CS2 Settlement Pattern Policy
- CS3 Strategy for Growth and Development
- CS11 Strategy for Development for Core and Hinterland Villages
- CS15 Implementing Sustainable Development in Babergh
- CS18 Mix and Types of Dwellings
- CS19 Affordable Homes
- CS21 Infrastructure Provision

Relevant saved policies of the Babergh Local Plan (Alteration No.2) 2006:

- CN01 Design Standards
- CR04 Special Landscape Areas
- CR07 Landscaping Schemes
- TP15 Parking Standards – New Development

Other material documents:

- Suffolk Adopted Parking Standards (2015)
- Rural Development and Core Strategy Policy CS11 Supplementary Planning Document, 2014

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework

Neighbourhood Plan Status

This application site is not within a Neighbourhood Development Plan area.

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

Parish Council

Chattisham and Hintlesham Parish Council

The Parish Council objects to this proposed development mainly due to the detrimental cumulative effect on the village's infrastructure and lack of housing need for even more very large dwellings. The character of the development and architectural styles are inappropriate for the area and there is a lack of affordable housing in the application. The architectural design is unimaginative and not suitable for a village location. Together with the first phase of development now under construction, it would result in a large section of Duke Street resembling a suburban style street with all houses having the same design features. We would strongly recommend a site visit to fully understand the imposition of this development on the otherwise diverse character of the street.

This application replaces a previously granted outline permission (DC/17/03982) for 11 houses (to include 3 affordable homes) granted in January 2018 after a BDC Planning Committee meeting in December 2017 after 7/6 vote in favour. The PC had vigorously opposed this application, requested its calling in to committee and spoken against it at the meeting. There is a signed S106 agreement relating to the affordable homes and some ecological mitigation with this permission.

The new application is for 4 x 2 bed semi-detached homes, 2 x 3 bed semi-detached homes, 4 x 3 bed detached homes with garages, 3 x 4 bed detached homes with garages and 1 x 5 bed detached home with garage. The village does not need any more 5 bedroomed houses.

The topography of the proposed site emphasises the dwellings' height making the site much more imposing than it looks on the submitted indicative street elevation. The proposed houses would restrict the views of the residents across the road and would loom above them as the ground is much higher on this east side of Duke Street. Residents also fear that parked vehicles outside the proposed properties would present a hazard because of reduced visibility on the rising ground.

There is no provision for affordable homes with the new application. A lengthy supporting document seeks to demonstrate that the inclusion of such housing would make the development unviable. CS11 states that all development outside of the BUAB of Hinterland Villages, should, inter alia, demonstrably meet a proven need for targeted market housing. This application makes no reference to Hintlesham's Housing Needs. The demand for social housing has been more than met with the recent development of 10 properties in Timperleys, with only half being occupied by residents.

In the last 10 year over 40 dwellings have had planning permission in Hintlesham with just under half still to be completed. The PC believes that the needs case for further development has diminished with every granted application. The cumulative impact of these developments has highlighted two aspects of village infrastructure which are already at full capacity, Firstly, the excessive traffic volumes on the A1071 and their impact on the village are well documented. Planned development in our cluster areas of Hadleigh and the Ipswich fringe further impact on the A1071 and Duke Street. Secondly, Suffolk County Council's own existing forecasts show that there are no surplus places at either the local Primary or High Schools.

SCC Strategic development response states that the projected minimum pupil yield for this development is: - 4 Primary (5-11 yrs) 3 Secondary (11-16 yrs) 1 Secondary (16+yrs) CIL contributions are not capable of assisting further places at Hintlesham Primary because the school's buildings and restricted playground cannot accommodate expansion. CS11 states that services and facilities must have capacity to accommodate further development, we cannot accommodate a further 14 dwellings.

As with a previous application from this developer the information given in the compliance check list contains misleading information: particularly relating to the distance from the bus stop which relates to the No. 90 bus (running just one return evening weekly and twice at the weekend) which will almost certainly cease after April; "The playing field being immediately adjacent to the proposed development" does not exist.

The application should be refused as it does not meet 2 of the 3 strands of sustainability – social & environmental: -

- It does not contain 2 of the necessary needs assessments
- It fails stated planning principles
- It breaches present and future landscape protection.

National Consultee

Environmental Agency

No comments.

Anglian Water

Anglian Water has assets close to or crossing this site or there are assets subject to an adoption agreement. Therefore, the site layout should take this into account and accommodate those assets within either prospectively adoptable highways or public open space. If this is not practicable then the sewers will need to be diverted at the developers cost under Section 185 of the Water Industry Act 1991. or, in the case of apparatus under an adoption agreement, liaise with the owners of the apparatus. It should be noted that the diversion works should normally be completed before development can commence.

The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Hintlesham-Wilderness H Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for these flows.

The sewerage system at present has available capacity for these flows via a gravity discharge connection to manhole 1902, as referenced in FRA 11.18.

The preferred method of surface water disposal would be to a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) with connection to sewer seen as the last option. Building Regulations (part H) on Drainage and Waste Disposal for England includes a surface water drainage hierarchy, with infiltration on site as the preferred disposal option, followed by discharge to watercourse and then connection to a sewer.

From the details submitted to support the planning application the proposed method of surface water management does not relate to Anglian Water operated assets and the developer is proposing discharge direct to a watercourse as per FRA 11.12. As such, we are unable to provide comments in the suitability of the surface water management. The Local Planning Authority should seek the advice of the Lead Local Flood Authority or the Internal Drainage Board.

Natural England

This development falls within the 13 km 'zone of influence' for the Stour and Orwell Estuaries Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site, as set out in the emerging Suffolk Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy ('RAMS'). It is anticipated that new housing development in this area is 'likely to have a significant effect', when considered either alone or in combination, upon the interest features of European Sites due to the risk of increased recreational pressure caused by that development.

As such, we advise that a suitable contribution to the emerging Suffolk RAMS should be sought from this residential development whilst ensuring that the delivery of the RAMS remains viable. If this does not occur in the interim period, then the per-house tariff in the adopted RAMS will need to be increased to ensure the RAMS is adequately funded. We therefore advise that you should not grant permission until such time as the implementation of this measure has been secured.

County Council Responses

SCC Fire and Rescue

No objection.

County Archaeological Service

This site lies in an area of archaeological potential recorded on the County Historic Environment Record, close to a Bronze Age metal work Hoard (HNS 023) and in a favourable topographic location on a south facing slope overlooking a river for early occupation. As a result, there is high potential for the discovery of below-ground heritage assets of archaeological importance within this area, and groundworks associated with the development have the potential to damage or destroy any archaeological remains which exist.

There are no grounds to consider refusal of permission in order to achieve preservation in situ of any important heritage assets. However, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 199), any permission granted should be the subject of a planning condition to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage asset before it is damaged or destroyed. In this case two conditions would be appropriate

SCC Flood and Water

No objection subject to conditions.

SCC Strategic Development

Education:

Based on existing forecasts, SCC will have no surplus places available at the catchment schools. On this basis, at the primary school level a future CIL funding bid of at least £48,724 (2018/19 costs) will be made and at the secondary school level a future CIL funding bid of at least £74,972 (2018/19 costs) will be made.

Pre-school:

From these development proposals SCC would anticipate up to 3 pre-school children arising, at a cost per place of £8,333. A future CIL funding bid of £24,999 (2018/19 costs) will be made.

Libraries:

A CIL contribution of £216 per dwelling is sought i.e. £3,024.

SCC Highways Authority

No objections subject to standard conditions.

Internal Consultee Responses

District Valuer

The scheme is not viable with 4 affordable units. Two rented units are viable (three units if the site DC/19/02585 is included)

BMSDC Environmental Health

No objection subject to conditions.

BMSDC - Land Contamination

No objection.

Place Services - Ecology

No objection subject to securing mitigation and enhancement measures.

B: Representations

At the time of writing this report at least 5 letters/emails/online comments have been received. It is the officer's opinion that this represents 5 objections. A verbal update shall be provided as necessary.

Views are summarised below: -

- Loss of light and outlook to Redhouse Cottages
- Lack of public open space
- Incorrect and misleading Design and Access Statement
- Noise and disturbance impacts on Warnham Lodge
- Loss of front hedgerow
- Estate type appearance out of keeping with village character
- No additional bus stops proposed.
- Overdevelopment of the site
- Increased strain on local services
- Traffic congestion and highway safety issues
- Contamination impacts during earthworks

(Note: All individual representations are counted and considered. Repeated and/or additional communication from a single individual will be counted as one representation.)

PLANNING HISTORY

REF: DC/17/03335	Submission of details (Reserved Matters) under outline planning permission B/15/01490/OUT- relating to Appearance, Layout & Scale for erection of 8 dwellings.	DECISION: GTD 18.09.2017
REF: DC/17/03982	Outline Planning Application (Access to be considered) - Erection of up to 11 Dwellings including 3 Affordable Houses.	DECISION: GTD 30.01.2018
REF: DC/18/00406	Discharge of Conditions for application B/15/01490/OUT - Condition 6 (Materials).	DECISION: GTD 01.03.2018
REF: DC/18/04988	Full Planning Application - Erection of 3no. dwellings	DECISION: WDN 10.01.2019
REF: B/15/01490	Outline - Erection of 8 no. dwellings (means of access and landscaping for consideration).	DECISION: GRA 01.04.2016

PART THREE – ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION

1. The Site and Surroundings

- 1.1 The site is located on Redhouse Farm to the south east boundary of Duke Street. It sits outside, but adjacent to, the Hintlesham Built Up Area Boundary (BUAB). The site boundaries are formed by Duke Street to the west, residential development under construction to the north by the subject applicant (B/01490/OUT and DC/17/03335) and south (Red House Cottages) and to the east is arable land (grade 3) associated with Redhouse Farm.
- 1.2 Hintlesham is listed as a Hinterland Village in policy CS2 of the development plan. The site is approximately 400m from the B1071 and is opposite residential dwellings which front onto the west side of Duke Street.
- 1.3 The site sits on the edge of the Gipping Valley Special Landscape Area. The site is not in a Conservation Area. There are not any nearby designated heritage assets.

2. The Proposal

- 2.1 The application seeks full planning permission for 14 double storey dwellings, set out in a linear manner, consistent with the indicative layout which supported the previous outline application approved in 2017. The dwellings comprise the following mix:
11 market houses:
 - 1 x 5 bed
 - 3 x 4 bed
 - 5 x 3 bed
 - 2 x 2 bed3 affordable dwellings:
 - 2 x 2 bed affordable rent
 - 1 x 3 bed shared ownership.The smaller dwellings at the southern end of the site feature hardstand parking to the front, while the larger dwellings toward the northern end of the site incorporate either integral garaging or detached garaging. 9 hardstand car spaces are proposed within the front landscaped strip between the internal road and Duke Street, toward the southern end of the site.
- 2.2 The floorspace of the affordable units are the 2 Bedroom (79sqm) affordable rent and 3 Bedroom (95sqm) shared ownership.
- 2.3 The site will be served by two accesses, one being a predominantly agricultural access to the north of the site, and the second being a new residential access to the southern end. An internal road runs parallel with Duke Street, with a landscape strip approximately one vehicle deep separating the two roads.
- 2.4 The application seeks full planning permission for 14 double storey dwellings, set out in a linear manner, consistent with the indicative layout which supported the previous outline application approved in 2017.
- 2.5 The gardens sizes range from 111 for Plot 4 square metres to 373 square metres for Plot 14.
- 2.6 The layout of the scheme is linear form of development which dwellings backing onto open agricultural fields. There are no issues of back-to-back distances or overlooking.

- 2.7 The dwellings are proposed in a Suffolk vernacular, with pitched roofs, gables and dormer windows. The fenestration is more contemporary in design. The palette of materials comprises facing brickwork, render, plain tiles and slate. The design and materials of the proposed dwellings are very similar to those already built to the north of the site.
- 2.8 Site Area is 0.9 hectares

3. The Principle of Development

- 3.1 The starting point for any planning decision is the development plan, as identified in Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Determination of any application must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. A key material consideration regarding the principle of development is the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019.
- 3.2 The age of policies itself does not cause them to cease to be part of the development plan or become “out of date” as identified in paragraph 213 of the NPPF. Significant weight should be given to the general public interest in having plan-led decisions even if the particular policies in a development plan may be old.
- 3.3 Even if policies are considered to be out of date, that does not make them irrelevant; their weight is not fixed, and the weight to be attributed to them is within the remit of the decision taker. There will be many cases where restrictive policies are given sufficient weight to justify refusal despite their not being up to date.
- 3.4 As a result of recent work towards a public inquiry, Babergh can currently demonstrate a five year land supply position of 5.67 years as required by paragraph 73 of the NPPF.
- 3.5 Also, as required by paragraph 213 of the NPPF, the weight attributed to development plan policies should be according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF. The closer the aims of a policy are to the NPPF, the greater the weight that can be attributed to them.
- 3.6 Policy CS1 ‘Applying the Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development in Babergh’ is in-step with paragraph 11 of the NPPF, even though the policy’s wording was based on the earlier 2012 NPPF. This policy is therefore afforded full weight. Policy CS11 is considered to be consistent with the NPPF and therefore has full weight. Policy CS15 sets out desirable characteristics for development which are based upon the principles of sustainable development which is also consistent with the NPPF and given full weight. Both policies CS11 and CS15 accord with the NPPF, particularly in relation to paragraph 77 and 78 of the NPPF relating to rural housing, locally identified needs and promoting sustainable development in rural areas, paragraph 103 relating to limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes, paragraph 127 to achieve well-designed places and paragraph 170 to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment.
- 3.7 Policy CS2 ‘Settlement Pattern Policy’ designates Hintlesham as a Hinterland Village. Policy CS2 requires that outside of the settlement boundary, development will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances subject to a proven justified need. This blanket approach is not entirely consistent with the NPPF, which favours a more balanced approach to decision-making. The NPPF does contain a not dissimilar exceptional circumstances test, set out at paragraph 79,

however it is only engaged where development is isolated. For the reasons set out in this report, the development is not isolated. Paragraph 79 of the NPPF is not engaged.

- 3.8 In the absence of an up to date allocations document and given the delay in the settlement boundaries review since the last local plan was adopted in 2006, coupled with the fact that its exceptional circumstances test is not wholly consistent with the NPPF, the policy cannot be given full weight. However, its overall strategy is appropriate in taking a responsible approach to spatial distribution, requiring the scale and location of new development to take into account local circumstances and infrastructure capacity. These elements are considered to be consistent with the NPPF and therefore the policy is given substantial weight.
- 3.9 The starting point for assessment purposes is the extant permission. The acceptability of developing the site for residential purposes has been established by virtue of the grant of outline permission in 2017. Development of the site for 11 dwellings can take place subject to the approval of reserved matters (which have not to date been sought). For this reason, some of the criteria of Policy CS11 and CS15 that would usually be relevant to a housing development outside the built up area boundary are considered to be met in this instance.
- 3.10 It has already been judged and accepted that:
- the site is a sustainable location for housing, with confirmed sustainable links to the village, its services and public transport links via the existing footpath running along the east side of Duke Street;
 - the site is well related to the village in physical and functional terms;
 - a linear approach to development along Duke Street is appropriate;
 - residential development of the site would not harm, to an unacceptable extent, the site's landscape setting;
 - there would be no adverse heritage impacts as there are not any nearby designated heritage assets;
 - there will be negligible impact on the nearest non-designated assets, a pair of cottages (Victoria Cottages) north of the site;
 - ecology and archaeology related impacts would be within acceptable parameters.
- 3.11 The application proposes only three dwellings additional to that already approved. The three additional dwellings would not result in adverse cumulative impacts when considered in combination with others completed/committed to in the cluster. Like the previously approved development, CIL provides a mechanism for local service providers (e.g. GP surgeries and schools) to adequately mitigate development and this development would contribute to providing CIL funding on a district wide and parish level, as set out in the relevant SCC referral response. The Parish Council's comments regarding Hintlesham Primary School and its potential inability to accommodate expansion are noted, however SCC does not raise this as a concern. There is no evidence from the local service providers to suggest that utilities infrastructure cannot serve, or would be significantly adversely impacted by, the additional three dwellings. The proposal would also not compromise delivery of already permitted or schemes.
- 3.12 The current application proposed a slightly different location for the principal vehicle access. The Highways Authority raises no objection on highway safety grounds. As with most developments on greenfield sites, the proposed level of on-site parking provision complies with the Suffolk Parking Standards. In this case the on-site parking exceeds minimum requirements. The proposal constitutes a policy compliant scheme in respect to vehicle access and on-site parking provision.

- 3.13 In light of the above and the previous outline approval, the key tests for consideration are:
- the impact of the development on the character and appearance of the area (scale, layout and character);
 - the appropriateness of the proposed landscaping response;
 - whether the development meets a locally identified need;
 - the appropriateness of an absence of affordable housing and development viability;
 - residential amenity impacts;
 - surface water drainage;
 - Ramsar contributions.
- 3.14 Council's 2014 Suffolk Wide Housing Needs Survey has demonstrated that there is a need for smaller homes, across all tenures. The proposal incorporates four two bedroom houses and six three bedroom houses, responding positively to the Needs Survey. The proposal will add to the stock of smaller properties in the village and is considered to meet an identified need for targeted market housing. This mix of units provides an acceptable range of property types and sizes.
- 3.15 The application is supported by a Viability Assessment that has been reviewed by the District Valuer. The Valuer concludes that the development is not viable with the inclusion of four affordable units. The valuer concludes that the development is viable if two affordable units are incorporated. During the course of this application the adjoining site has come forward with a proposal of three dwellings. The LPA has insisted that both sites, which are in the same ownership should be considered in the viability assessment. This has resulted in a further affordable dwelling being viable on the site, making a total of three for the combined sites. It is recommended that if the Planning Committee is minded to grant permission, that it be subject to a s106 agreement requiring the provision of two affordable units. The type of units can be negotiated as part of the agreement drafting process. The applicant has confirmed agreement with this requirement and approach.
- 3.16 Although the proposal is not fully compliant with policy CS19 a viability assessment has concluded that the 35% requirement for affordable housing would make the site unviable, three affordable units can be provided over the two sites. The applicant and the LPA's Strategic Housing Team have agreed that this is acceptable.

4. Nearby Services and Connections Assessment of Proposal

- 4.1 Hintlesham is a well-connected village by road to Ipswich and Hadleigh. There is a regular bus service (No.91) which connects Sudbury with Ipswich. The village offers residents a primary school, public house, community hall, sporting facilities, a hotel, golf club, some employment opportunities. Therefore, the village is considered to be a well connected village and a sustainable location.

5. Site Access, Parking and Highway Safety Considerations

- 5.1 The site will be served by two accesses, one being a predominantly agricultural access to the north of the site, and the second being a new residential access to the southern end. An internal road runs parallel with Duke Street, with a landscape strip approximately one vehicle deep separating the two roads. The smaller dwellings at the southern end of the site feature hardstand parking to the front, while the larger dwellings toward the northern end of the site incorporate either integral garaging or detached garaging. 9 hardstand car spaces are proposed within the

front landscaped strip between the internal road and Duke Street, toward the southern end of the site. SCC Highways have raised no objection to the scheme subject to standard conditions to secure visibility splays, details of the estate road and footpaths, details of refuse bin storage and collection areas, parking, details of surface water drainage and conditions for HGVs at construction phase.

6. Design and Layout [Impact on Street Scene]

- 6.1 Objectors are critical of the design of the dwellings. The Parish Council describes the architectural design as unimaginative. Officers do not share the same concerns. The design approach is one that successfully blends the traditional with the contemporary. Traditional forms, such as pitched roofs, gables and dormer windows, integrate well with contemporary fenestration detailing. The result is a well composed, well considered design response. Noteworthy is the consistency of the proposal's appearance with the approved development immediately to the north, which is currently under construction, also being developed by the applicant. The development will add to the overall quality of the area, is visually attractive and will contribute positively to local village character, consistent with local and national policy guidance.
- 6.2 Overdevelopment is a concern for some objectors. There is no denying that with an addition of three extra dwellings, the density of development is greater than that previously approved. However, officers do not consider that a 15/16 dwelling per hectare development represents overdevelopment. Officers agree with the supporting Planning Statement which contends that the density reflects the character and grain of development in the local vicinity.
- 6.3 The dwellings are certainly sited relatively close to each other, perhaps closer than most housing proposals on greenfield land in the open countryside. However, the level of intimacy offered by the close siting of dwellings is not alien to the area. Housing on the opposite side of Duke Street, particularly toward the south of the site, is closely related and exhibits a level of intimacy not unlike that proposed. Offsetting the effect on the streetscape of the close dwelling arrangement is the considerable setback of the development from the street. The retention of the frontage hedgerow, and the well-articulated front facades of the dwellings, offers visual relief and further mitigates the streetscape effect. The relatively narrow side setbacks between the dwellings is therefore not fatal to the proposal.
- 6.4 The three affordable dwellings would be provided on-site to the south of the development. They would comprise a pair of semi-detached two bedroomed dwellings for the affordable rent (Plots 1 and 2) and the three bedroomed shared ownership dwelling would also be semi-detached (Plot 5).

7. Landscape Impact, Trees, Ecology, Biodiversity and Protected Species

- 7.1 Landscaping is an important element, and this has been considered as part of the design response. Hedgerow replacement will complement the frontage hedgerow that is to be retained, an important streetscape gesture. Landscaping opportunities have been taken up across the site. Landscaping to the rear boundary that abuts arable fields will provide an appropriate rural edge treatment, in time limiting the development's visual impact on long range views toward the site from distant points on Chattisham Lane to the east.
- 7.2 The impact of additional housing on the character of the nearby Special Landscape Area was considered in some detail as part of the previous outline application. The conclusions drawn in

that assessment apply equally to the current application (noting the extent of the site is unchanged from the outline approval):

'On balance, it is considered that the proposed development would relate satisfactorily to the wider landscape and will not be detrimental to the characteristics of the wider Special Landscape Area to any significant degree... The development will include good levels of landscaping and the inclusion of small areas of open space which will act as a buffer and soften the landscape setting from the adjacent road.'

- 7.3 A s106 contribution was secured as part of the previous outline permission. It is recommended, consistent with Natural England's referral response, that contributions are again secured by the same means. The contributions are not of scale that will impact the scheme's viability beyond that considered in the applicant's supporting viability report.

8. Land Contamination, Flood Risk, Drainage and Waste

- 8.1 A land contamination assessment accompanied the application and the Environmental Protection Team have raised no objection to the scheme on land contamination issues.
- 8.2 SCC Flood and Water has reviewed the submitted Flood Risk Assessment and drainage details and do not raise an objection subject to conditions. Anglian Water also do not raise objection to the scheme.

9. Heritage Issues [Including the Impact On the Character and Appearance of The Conservation Area and on the Setting of Neighbouring Listed Buildings]

- 9.1 This is not a consideration of this application.

10. Impact on Residential Amenity

- 10.1 Paragraph 127(f) 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 all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.
- 10.2 Objectors are concerned with the development's interface with Redhouse Cottages. It is correct that the built form is brought closer to Redhouse Cottages than that shown on the indicative layout which supported the outline approval. This does not make for an unacceptable interface.
- 10.3 The separation distance between Redhouse Cottage and the proposed built form is such that the amenity of the occupiers of Redhouse Cottages will not be unacceptably compromised. There is only one upper level window in the flank elevation of the dwelling on plot 1 facing Redhouse Cottages and it is non-habitable. Privacy levels will be maintained. The built form is sited north of Redhouse Cottages. Sunlight and daylight levels at Redhouse Cottages will be unaffected. The dwelling's setback from the common boundary will ensure that visual bulk is contained well within acceptable parameters. Outlook from Redhouse Cottages will only be marginally impacted, noting that the proposed built form has been sited in a manner that does not impinge direct views out from the rear of the neighbouring cottages. For these reasons the proposed southern residential interface is acceptable.

- 10.4 Concerns have been raised regarding noise and disturbance impacts on Warnham Lodge, a dwelling located on the opposite side of Duke Street. The road, together with the proposed internal road and landscaping strip between the two roads, will serve as a generous and effective amenity buffer and will mitigate noise and disturbance impacts to within acceptable limits for all dwellings located on the western side of Duke Street. Comings and goings from the development will add to the traffic in the area and as a result there will be a noticeable change in local vehicle movements, as there is with any new development. There is no evidence to suggest the additional traffic movements will result in unacceptable residential amenity outcomes.

11. Planning Obligations / CIL (delete if not applicable)

- 11.1 A viability assessment was carried out for the 14 dwellings and it was concluded that two affordable units would be required for the site. However, the application for the adjoining site (DC/19/02585) was received after the assessment had been carried out. The site is in the same ownership as the adjoining site and therefore the LPA insisted that the assessment should include the two sites which a total number of 17 dwellings. The viability assessment found that three affordable units would be appropriate over the two sites, combined. The three affordable units will be included onsite in the site for 14 dwellings. This would be secured by way of a S.106 agreement.
- 11.2 The scheme is liable for CIL contribution.
- 11.3 The site is within the 13km Zone of Influence identified for the Stour and Orwell Estuaries Special Protection Area and Ramsar site. The Habitats Regulation Assessment confirms the proposal triggers a proportionate financial contribution towards visitor management measures for the Habitats Sites. It is recommended that s106 contribution addresses this requirement, consistent with the recent approvals at neighbouring sites. This would be secured by way of a S.106 agreement.

PART FOUR – CONCLUSION

12. Planning Balance and Conclusion

- 12.1 The site benefit from an extant permission for 11 dwellings. The site continues to comprise a sustainable location for housing, well related to the village and served by sustainable linkages to village services.
- 12.2 The additional three dwellings that are proposed will not negatively impact landscape, heritage, highway safety, ecology, archaeology, drainage or residential amenity matters.
- 12.3 A 14 dwelling development is not sufficiently viable to sustain four affordable dwellings. The District Valuer however is of the view it can sustain three affordable units. A s106 agreement is recommended to secure three affordable units and Ramsar contributions. The S.106 agreement would be a joint agreement covering both this site and the site for three dwellings to the north. However, all three affordable units would be sited on this site.
- 10.4 Like the previous development, environmental harm is limited and social and economic benefits outweigh the identified harm. The proposal delivers sustainable development and the application is recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION

That the application is GRANTED planning permission/listing building consent/other and includes the following conditions: -

- Standard time limit
- Approved plans
- Site levels
- As required by highways
- As required by SCC Floods
- As required by BMSDC Environmental Health
- Details of fire hydrants
- Ecological mitigation and enhancement measures
- Archaeological work and monitoring
- Sustainability/Energy Reduction

That authority be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer to grant fully planning permission

Subject to the prior agreement of a Section 106 Planning Obligation on appropriate terms to the satisfaction of the Chief Planning Officer to secure:

- Affordable housing
- RAMS contribution