

## **Committee Report**

**Item 7C**

**Reference:** DC/19/04273

**Case Officer:** Alex Scott

**Ward:** Walsham-le-Willows.

**Ward Member/s:** Cllr Richard Meyer.

---

## **RECOMMENDATION – GRANT APPROVAL OF RESERVED MATTERS WITH CONDITIONS**

---

### **Description of Development**

Submission of details under Outline Planning Application 1352/17 - Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for erection of up to 60 no. dwellings

### **Location**

Land West of, Wattisfield Road, Walsham Le Willows, Suffolk

**Expiry Date:** 07/02/2020

**Application Type:** RES - Reserved Matters

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

**Applicant:** Lovell Partnerships

**Agent:** Saunders Boston Limited

**Parish:** Walsham Le Willows

**Site Area:** 2.80ha

**Density of Development:**

Gross Density (Total Site): 21.4dph

Net Density (Developed Site, excluding open space and SuDs): 29dph

**Details of Previous Committee / Resolutions and any member site visit:** Outline Planning Permission ref: 1352/17 approved by Committee, subject to conditions, on 9<sup>th</sup> May 2018.

**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/s:

It is a “Major” application for:

- a residential development for 15 or more dwellings.
-

---

## **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  
FC02 - Provision And Distribution Of Housing  
CS01 - Settlement Hierarchy  
CS02 - Development in the Countryside & Countryside Villages  
CS03 - Reduce Contributions to Climate Change  
CS04 - Adapting to Climate Change  
CS05 - Mid Suffolk's Environment  
CS06 - Services and Infrastructure  
CS09 - Density and Mix  
GP01 - Design and layout of development  
HB14 - Ensuring archaeological remains are not destroyed  
H07 - Restricting housing development unrelated to needs of countryside  
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  
CL11 - Retaining high quality agricultural land  
T02 - Minor Highway improvements  
T09 - Parking Standards  
T10 - Highway Considerations in Development  
T11 - Facilities for pedestrians and cyclists  
RT04 - Amenity open space and play areas within residential development  
RT12 - Footpaths and Bridleways

### **Neighbourhood Plan Status**

This application site is within a Neighbourhood Plan Area.

The Neighbourhood Plan is currently at:-

Stage 1: Designated neighbourhood area

Accordingly, the Neighbourhood Plan has Little weight.

### **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**

### **Town/Parish Council (Appendix 3)**

Walsham Le Willows Parish Council – 12<sup>th</sup> Oct. 2019 – Object:

- 1) Lack of play area (Nearest 1.2km away)
- 2) Deliverability of pedestrian link along Wattisfield Road
- 3) Parking Spaces insufficient
- 4) Weak and repetitive building design

Walsham Le Willows Parish Council – 13<sup>th</sup> Dec. 2019 – Object:

- 1) Fencing/screening to all boundaries should be completed as part of Phase I rather than Phase II;
- 2) Clarification should be provided on the provision of streetlighting and the impact this would have on nearby residents and the environment;
- 3) Maintain objections with regards proposed quality of design and ask that this is addressed;
- 4) Footpath and Road Issues.

### **National Consultee (Appendix 4)**

Highways England – 13<sup>th</sup> Dec. 2019 – Offer no objection – Highways Act Section 175B is not relevant to this application – This development is a little way from the Strategic Road Network and is therefore unlikely to have a severe impact.

Highways England – 20<sup>th</sup> Sept. 2019 – Offer no objection – This proposal is unlikely to have a severe impact upon the Strategic Road Network.

Natural England – 17<sup>th</sup> Dec. 2019 – Have no comments to make on this application.

Anglian Water – 2<sup>nd</sup> Oct.2019 – Water Recycling Centre has available capacity for projected flows.

Anglian Water – 17<sup>th</sup> Oct. 2019 – Water Recycling Centre does not have capacity to treat flows – AW are obligated to accept the foul flows from the development with the benefit of planning consent and would take the necessary steps to ensure that there is sufficient treatment capacity should permission be granted.

Anglian Water – 5<sup>th</sup> Dec. 2019 – Preferred method of surface water disposal would be to an on-site SuDs with connection to mains sewer as last option – The proposed method of surface water discharge does not relate to Anglian Water asset(s) – advise LPA should consult the LLFA and Environment Agency.

NHS – West Suffolk – 15<sup>th</sup> Oct. 2019 – There are 2 GP practices within close proximity of the proposed development – These practices do not have sufficient capacity for the additional growth resulting from this development and cumulatively with other development growth in the area – Developer contribution via CIL, therefore required.

NHS – West Suffolk – 12<sup>th</sup> Dec. 2019 – Refer to previous response sent as this is still relevant.

Environment Agency – 16<sup>th</sup> Oct. 2019 – No significant constraints in the area – No comments to make on the application.

### **County Council Responses (Appendix 5)**

SCC-Highways – 6<sup>th</sup> Dec. 2019 – Revised layout 0501 Rev. K now considered acceptable in highway terms.

SCC-Travel Plan Officer – 16<sup>th</sup> Sept. 2019 – No comment – rural location and size of development do not meet threshold for Travel Plan requirement.

SCC-Local Lead Flood Authority – 15<sup>th</sup> Jan. 2020 – Density/number of housing and allocation of site for open SuDs features to be decided by the local planning authority.

SCC-Local Lead Flood Authority – 6<sup>th</sup> Dec. 2019 – Maintain Holding Objection – The layout looks to utilise a hybrid SuDs system rather than a full SuDs system that would collect, convey and discharge surface water. A hybrid SuDs system does not offer the full multifunctional benefits – Action required in order to overcome current objection:

- 1) Resubmit the layout utilising a full SuDs system
  - a. If a hybrid SuDs system is to be utilised, then a viability statement is to be submitted to the LPA.

SCC-Local Lead Flood Authority – 1<sup>st</sup> Oct. 2019 – Maintain Holding Objection – The applicant has not addressed the points from the previous consultant reply on the 18<sup>th</sup> Sept. 2019.

SCC-Local Lead Flood Authority – 18<sup>th</sup> Sept. 2019 – Holding Objection:

- Layout utilises a hybrid SUDs system rather than a full SUDs system – viability required
- Landscaping for SUDs required: 80% hydro seeding fescues or bent grasses and 20% wild flowers
- Demonstration of how attenuation basin will be established prior to utilisation required

SCC-Archaeology – 13<sup>th</sup> Sept. 2019 – All work completed – No further requirements.

SCC-Fire Officer – 17<sup>th</sup> Dec. 2019 – Have previously made comment - No new comment to be made.

SCC-Infrastructure – 16<sup>th</sup> Sept. 2019 – Outline permission ref: 1352/17 subject to obligations dated 05 July 2018 – RES application linked to this.

SCC-Infrastructure – 9<sup>th</sup> Dec. 2019 – Have no further comments to make in respect of the re-consultation.

### **Internal Consultee Responses (Appendix 6)**

MSDC – Strategic Planning (Planning Policy) 18<sup>th</sup> Oct. 2019 – Will not be responding.

Place Services – Landscape 2<sup>nd</sup> Jan. 2020 – Content that previous recommendations have been taken into consideration and are therefore satisfied with the application as it stands – No objection subject to suggested conditions.

Place Services – Landscape 9<sup>th</sup> Dec. 2019 – Welcome amendments proposed by maintain holding objection for the following reasons:

- 1) Addition of Local Play Area supported – however recommend a more suitable level of POS within the development is achieved;
- 2) Request more street Trees are provided, especially on the primary road.
- 3) Recommend additional planting within the detention drainage basin;
- 4) Recommend block paving to proposed parking courts;
- 5) Request an amended D&A statement incorporating proposed amendments.

Place Services – Landscape 3<sup>rd</sup> Oct. 2019 – Cannot be supportive of application as it stands and recommend the following amendments to the scheme:

- 1) LEAP or LLAP required within the proposed development;
- 2) Advise layout is amended to provide street trees;
- 3) Sections and plans of SUDS features, including proposed planting, required;
- 4) Softer, more natural approach required around attenuation basin, in lieu of proposed post and rail fence;
- 5) Brick walls, rather than close board fencing to all plot boundaries which face onto the public realm;
- 6) Rectangular shaped gardens advised, with 50m<sup>2</sup> for 1 and 2 bed properties and 100m<sup>2</sup> for 3 or more bedroom properties;
- 7) Soft landscaping to pumping station required, in lieu of close board fencing currently proposed;
- 8) Soft landscaping to parking courts advised.

Place Services – Landscape 18<sup>th</sup> Sept. 2019 – Holding Objection:

- 1) Street Trees on Primary Road
- 2) Sectional plans and proposed planting for SUDs features
- 3) Dwellings should front onto footpath to west of site to provide passive surveillance
- 4) Brick Walls rather than close board fences to public realm boundary treatments
- 5) Private gardens should be rectangular and provide 50m<sup>2</sup> for 1 and 2 bed properties and 100m<sup>2</sup> for 3+ bed properties
- 6) Pumping station to be screened with soft boundary planting rather than close board fencing
- 7) Soft landscaping to parking courts

Place Services-Ecology – 17<sup>th</sup> Dec. 2019 – Maintain Holding Objection:

Detailed soft landscaping design and Ecological Design Strategy have yet to be provided for this development to meet the requirements of conditions 2 & 25 secured at outline stage of this application.

Place Services-Ecology – 3<sup>rd</sup> Oct. 2019 - Holding Objection:

- 1) Ecological Design Strategy required
- 2) Object to use of Beech Trees due to soil type (Hornbeam advised)
- 3) Object to Siberian Dogwood which is non-native species (Common Dogwood advised)

MSDC-Land Contamination – 17<sup>th</sup> Dec. 2019 – No comments to make with respect to the submitted documentation from the perspective of land contamination.

MSDC-Sustainability – 12<sup>th</sup> Dec. 2019 – Previous response is still relevant.

MSDC-Sustainability – 30<sup>th</sup> Sept. 2019 – Following needs to be addressed:

- 1) Energy and resource conservation needs to be addressed
- 2) Electric vehicle charging points to be demonstrated.

MSDC-Environmental Health – Other Issues – 30<sup>th</sup> Sept. 2019 – Construction Management Required.

MSDC-Public Realm – 12<sup>th</sup> Dec. 2019 – Welcome the addition of toddler play equipment – wider open space now, however limited.

MSDC-Public Realm – 1<sup>st</sup> Oct. 2019 – Cannot Support the latest revised proposal - Given the clarification from the Wild Wood Trust about the proposed new footpath link to the existing play area, consider it essential that local play provision is included within the proposed development.

MSDC-Public Realm – 18<sup>th</sup> Sept. 2019 – Support Rationale behind not providing formal play facilities on site and linking to nearby facilities – Question land ownership and rights of access with regards proposed footpath link – Expect a small toddler play area on the proposed northern open space would benefit the development - concern with regards long walk to existing play area from the site due to continuous housing to western and southern site boundaries – Would expect a local management solution to be put in place to manage the proposed open space as it largely benefits the development and immediate surroundings.

MSDC-Communities – 7<sup>th</sup> Oct. 2019 – Support views of MSDC-Public Realm in regard to the inadequacies of the proposed open space/green provision within the application.

MSDC-Communities – 18<sup>th</sup> Dec. 2019 – Concur with the public realm response dated 12<sup>th</sup> Dec, stating the need for an increase in wider open space provision within this development.

MSDC-Heritage – 17<sup>th</sup> Sept. 2019 – Do not wish to offer comment on this application.

MSDC-Waste Management Services – 17<sup>th</sup> Oct. 2019 – No objection – Subject to conditions ensuring a 32 tonne RCV can navigate the site and suitable bin collection points are proposed.

MSDC-Disability Forum – 17<sup>th</sup> Dec. 2019 – No further comments.

MSDC-Infrastructure – 16<sup>th</sup> Sept. 2019 – CIL to be charged at £115 per square metre for market dwellings – Affordable dwellings, secured by way of s106 agreement would be exempt from CIL provided that they meet the conditions set out in Reg. 49 of the 2010 CIL Regulations.

MSDC-Strategic Housing – 17<sup>th</sup> Dec. 2019 – Previous response unchanged and reiterate point that we require clarification with regards adoptable status of private drive – Not that agent states affordable dwellings would meet NDSS, but clarification required – Also require clarification on tenure.

MSDC-Strategic Housing – 2<sup>nd</sup> Oct. 2019 – Mix appropriate – Clarification on size of properties required (Should meet NDSS) – Adoptable status of proposed private drive also required.

## **B: Representations**

At the time of writing this report at least 17 letters/emails/online comments have been received. It is the officer opinion that this represents 17 objections. A verbal update shall be provided as necessary.

Views are summarised below:-

- Request that efforts be made for a proportion of dwelling to meet Part M4 of Building Regulations (Access to and use of Buildings);
- Concerns of the safety and eligibility of the proposed footpath;
- Concerns over the aesthetics of the development, and the safety and eligibility of the proposed footpath;
- Concerns over the safety and eligibility of the proposed footpath, and the lack of play area provision;
- Concerns over the safety and eligibility of the proposed footpath, and the limited capacity of the local primary school;
- Concerns over: the safety and eligibility of the proposed footpath, the unattractive aesthetic of the East side of the proposed development, and the limited capacity of the local primary school;
- Concerns over the safety and eligibility of the proposed footpath, and the lack of play area provision;
- Concerns over the safety and eligibility of the proposed footpath;
- Concerns regarding the lack of privacy to existing residents on the Southern Boundary of the development, and the site access;
- Concerns regarding: the safety and eligibility of the proposed footpath, the unattractive aesthetics of the proposed elevations, and the lack of parking on the site.

(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:** 1352/17

Outline application with all matters reserved except access for the erection of up to 60 dwellings

**DECISION:** GTD  
05.07.2018

---

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

---

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

- 1.1. The site in question is currently open countryside and approx. 2.80ha of agricultural land (grade 3). The site contains a natural enclosure from the wider open countryside due to the existing mature hedges and trees that surround the site to the north/west. There is also a public footpath that runs along the north western edges of the site, which would help to naturally include the site with the existing southern built form. The existing tree and hedgerow belt is proposed to be retained and enhanced, as well as off-site habitat enhancement.
- 1.2. The site is adjacent to the settlement boundary of Walsham-le-Willows, which is a designated primary village in accordance with Policy CS1 of the adopted Mid-Suffolk Core Strategy (2008), and is known as a Core Village in the emerging Babergh & Mid-Suffolk Joint Local Plan. Walsham-le-Willows being a primary village, some basic local services can be found to meet local needs.

## **2. The Proposal**

- 2.1. The application is submitted further to outline planning permission ref: 1352/17, granted in July 2018, and seeks approval of reserved matters relating to the Layout, Scale, Appearance and Landscaping of 60 no. dwellings.
- 2.2. The application proposes delivery of 39 market housing units and 21 affordable housing units, as well as well as approximately 0.53 hectares of Public Space and a Local Area for Play (Toddler Play Equipment). The existing Public Right of Way which bounds the northern boundary of the site is proposed to be retained and enhanced landscape planting is proposed. A large surface water attenuation basin is also proposed within the public open space to the north of the site, which would both serve as a Sustainable Surface Water Drainage (SuDs) and amenity feature.
- 2.3. The proposed density of housing development would be approximately 29 dwellings per hectare, with back to back distances of no less than 20.5 metres.
- 2.4. The proposed dwelling heights are broken down as follows:

### **Market Dwellings**

Single Storey Semi-Detached (Bungalows)	= 3 no.
Two Storey Detached Dwellings	= 22 no.
Two Storey Semi-Detached Dwellings	= 14 no.
TOTAL	= 39 no.

### **Affordable Dwellings**

Two Storey Semi-Detached	= 14 no.
Two Storey Terrace Dwellings	= 3 no.
Two Storey Flats Building	= 2 no. (Containing 4 no. Flats)
TOTAL	= 21 no.

- 2.5. The proposed bedroom numbers are broken down as follows:

### **Market Dwellings**

1 Bedroom	= 0 no.
2 Bedroom	= 6 no.

3 Bedroom = 19 no.  
4 Bedroom = 10 no.  
5 Bedroom = 4 no.

**Affordable Dwellings**

1 Bedroom = 4 no.  
2 Bedroom = 13 no.  
3 Bedroom = 4 no.

- 2.6. The proposed dwellings would be provided in a range of types and styles. Proposed external facing material would be a mix of facing red brick (Ibstock, Leicester weathered red brick proposed), cream and salmon coloured render, with horizontal dark grey cladding details. Roofing materials would be a mix of rustic red and dark grey pantiles and rustic red and light grey plain tiles (all by Weinerberger. All windows will be white UPVC, with black doors.

**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 only. While there are objections and comments on principle issues, these have been dealt with under the outline granted.
- 3.2. The issues of Layout, Scale, Appearance and Landscaping only are for consideration.

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

- 4.1. The point of access and connections to the site have been dealt with under the outline permission. The outline permission also establishes the principle of 60 dwellings and related traffic to and from the site. However, layout of parking and visitor parking is for considerations and meets the requirements under the SCC Parking Standards. The parking proposals are as follows: -
- 103 no. allocated parking spaces  
27 no. Garage spaces  
15 no. Visitor/Informal off road parking bays
- 4.2. Parking provision is considered to meet the minimum requirement for parking places as shown in the Suffolk Parking for Guidance 2015.
- 4.3. In conclusion, the provision of 60 dwellings and the access point 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. Your officers consider the changes during the course of the application have now created a spacious layout with access to public green space, the countryside and village services. It is considered that the applicant has addressed all concerns by making important and substantial changes to the layout with a complete review of the site. It is considered that the latest scheme before you are the result of beneficial amendments and improvements to the proposal to that originally submitted.

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

- 5.1. The development is predominantly two-storey, however the developer has sought to provide 3 no. Bungalows as part of the development, 2 no. of which would be at the entrance to the development, adjacent to the only abutting neighbouring property.
- 5.2. The layout has been discussed above in part, but essentially relates to 3 no. branch roads spurring off the principle access road, with 2 no. of the branch roads connecting via private drives and looping round, back to the principle road. Paved footpaths are also proposed adjacent to the principle estate road, and along the frontage of the site, linking the site access to the open space and rural public footpath network to the north of the site. The proposed layout is considered to create a welcoming, quality, pedestrian-friendly residential environment. Back gardens meet back gardens or the landscaped site boundary to the west and avoid unsupervised spaces. The public green space to the north, and landscaped boundary to the west, provide green corridors to accord with landscaping recommendations, as well as creating a softer buffer to the adjoining countryside. The proposed public footpaths and green spaces also link into the existing PROW network and provide access to the countryside and to the south, connecting to villages services and facilities (off site highway works, to provide a connecting footway were secured by way of condition of outline planning permission). Discussions with the developer since the application was originally submitted has led to a number of improvements to the connections across and around the site, and on-site public open space and play provision, that taken together have resulted in attractive spaces between dwellings to encourage activity and good sense of place, with direct links to the open countryside.
- 5.3. The proposed housing density of 29 dwellings per hectare, although lower than the 40 dph as set out in development plan policy CS9, is considered to be acceptable given the existing character and development density of the village (existing development density of the village is approximately 14.45 dph).
- 5.4. The layout proposes a wide range of house types, with 12 total variations proposed. The resulting range of house types enjoy detailed features with a greater range of character variances when compared to an average estate of a similar scale. It is considered that the proposals will provide a development of sufficient interest and individual character, suitable in the proposed location. The scheme delivers a range of housing types which would provide a suitable mix address and would deliver 21 no. affordable housing units.
- 5.5. Your Strategic Housing Officers have assessed the application proposal and are satisfied that the proposed would deliver affordable dwellings of a type, tenure and scale that is acceptable, in accordance with current policy and standards. Your Strategic Housing Officers have, however, required further information with regards of the size and scale of the affordable units proposed, in order to confirm that they meet with Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS). Your planning officers, however, consider that sufficient information has already been provided by the applicant in the form of the scaled, detailed plans and elevations submitted.

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

- 6.1. The proposed scheme of landscaping, providing strong landscape buffering, of appropriate species, to the north and west countryside boundaries, is considered appropriate to the type and scale of development proposed. The proposed scheme of landscaping is also considered to provide green corridors traversing the countryside edges of the site, to the benefit of ecological species.
- 6.2. Council landscape consultants have been consulted on the application proposal and, although satisfied with the majority of landscaping proposed, raise an element of concern with regards the

lack of tree planting within the street, -scene and along the Wattisfield Road frontage in particular. Your Planning Officers consider an appropriate balance between landscaping and highway visibility has been struck, with at least some tree planting being proposed within the street scene, and the majority of the existing hedgerow fronting Wattisfield Road being retained and enhanced.

- 6.3. Overall the proposed scheme of landscaping is considered to screen and soften the proposed development into the existing landscape, to create an appropriate soft edge to the village in this location, and to provide suitable opportunities for ecological species.

## **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 and density 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 and the single-storey scale dwellings (Bungalows) proposed closest to the nearest existing neighbouring dwelling to the south.
- 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.

## **8.1. Surface Water Drainage and Flood Risk**

- 8.1. The applicant has produced a detailed Flood Risk Assessment / Surface Water Drainage Strategy, carried out by a suitably qualified Company (MTC Engineering), submitted with the application.
- 8.2. The report is considered to satisfactorily demonstrate that the proposed development is at 'low' risk of flooding from all sources.
- 8.3. The proposed surface water drainage strategy submitted is based on attenuation storage, with discharge to adjacent land drainage ditches, and the proposed layout incorporates attenuation storage in the north-east corner of the site, that forms an integral part of the development scheme and the surface water drainage strategy for the site.
- 8.4. The NPPF requires that, for major applications such as this, sustainable drainage systems for the management of run-off are put in place, unless demonstrated to be inappropriate. Sustainable drainage is an approach to managing surface water run-off which seeks to mimic natural drainage systems and retain water on or near the site, as opposed to traditional drainage approaches, involving piping water off-site as quickly as possible. SuDS involve a range of techniques including soakaways, infiltration trenches, permeable surfaces, grassed swales, ponds and

wetlands. SuDS offer significant advantages over conventional pipe drainage systems in reducing flood risk by attenuating the rate and quality of surface water run-off from a site, promoting groundwater recharge and improving water quality amenity.

- 8.5. National Planning Practice Guidance directs what sort of SuDS should be considered. Generally, the aim should be to discharge surface water run-off as high up the below hierarchy of options as reasonably practicable:
  - 1) Into the ground (infiltration);
  - 2) To a surface water body;
  - 3) To a surface water sewer, highway drain or another drainage system;
  - 4) To a combined sewer.
- 8.6. The NPPG provides that the particular types of SuDS may not be practicable in all locations.
- 8.7. The applicant's site investigation and infiltration test results have confirmed that a surface water drainage strategy, based on infiltration of run-off is not viable for the site.
- 8.8. In addition to the above, the NPPF also requires that developments do not increase flood risk elsewhere.
- 8.9. Accordingly the applicant has proposed the following surface water drainage strategy for the site:
  - Driveways and parking areas to be constructed using permeable paving;
  - Adoptable highway to drain to receiving drainage system (Swales and Attenuation Pond);
  - Receiving drainage system to discharge to discharge to site boundary ditch system via the detention basin and flow control device in the north-east corner of the site (The attenuation storage basin is designed for all storms up to and including a 1 in 100 year event +40% allowance for climate change);
  - A new swale will be provided along the western site boundary, linking the existing ditch along the northern side of the site to divert overland flow from adjacent land.
- 8.10. SCC-Local Lead Flood Authority (LLFA) have been consulted on the application proposal and maintain a holding objection on the basis that the proposed scheme of surface water drainage relates to a hybrid, and not a full, SuDS system. In their final responses the LLFA do, however acknowledge that the proposed hybrid system may be considered acceptable, should a suitable viability case be made, to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.
- 8.11. Further to the comments provided by the LLFA, the applicant has produced a surface water drainage viability statement which concludes that the hybrid surface water drainage proposal current proposed enables the proposed number of units to be delivered and that should it be insisted that a full SuDS system (including a system of Swales across the site totalling 13.7% of the developable area) then this would result in a loss of units (8 or 9 units projected to be lost), making the scheme unviable. It should be noted that the site has several fixed abnormal costs which also need to be factored into the proposal's viability, including off site highway improvements, provision of a foul water pumping station and provision of an electricity sub-station. In order to recover the loss of revenue from the reduction in the number of units and make the scheme viable the applicant considers they would need to submit a full viability statement to reduce the affordable housing provision from 35% (as currently proposed) to between 5% and 15%.

- 8.12. In assessing the proposal, your officers consider the surface water drainage scheme, as currently proposed, although not an ideal full SuDS system, would suitably manage surface water runoff from the proposed development and would not demonstrably result in significant increased flood risk on the site or elsewhere. The social benefits of maximising affordable housing on the site are, therefore, considered to outweigh the environmental dis-benefits of not delivering a full open SuDS system, in this case.

---

## **PART FOUR – CONCLUSION**

---

### **9. Planning Balance and Conclusion**

- 9.1. 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 green public space assets for the community to benefit from. Overall the development is considered to provide an attractive place with a range of house types to meet both affordable and housing needs at all levels.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

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

- Approved Plans and Documents;
- Landscape Management Plan, as recommended by Council Landscape Consultants;
- Sustainability measures, as recommended by Council Environmental Protection Officers;
- Those already imposed as part of Outline Planning Permission Ref: 1352/17.