

Committee Report

Item 7B

Reference: DC/19/05627

Case Officer: Alex Scott

Ward: Haughley, Stowupland & Wetherden.

Ward Member/s: Cllr Keith Welham. Cllr Rachel Eburne.

RECOMMENDATION – GRANT RESERVED MATTERS WITH CONDITIONS

Description of Development

Submission of details under Outline Permission DC/18/04773 - Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for erection of up to 65no. dwellings

Location

Land To The West Of, Fishponds Way, Haughley, Suffolk

Expiry Date: 04/03/2020

Application Type: RES - Reserved Matters

Development Type: Major Small Scale - Dwellings

Applicant: Bellway Homes

Agent: Strutt And Parker

Parish: Haughley

Site Area: 5.11 ha.

Density of Development:

Gross Density (Total Site): 12.72 dph.

Net Density (Developed Site, excluding open space and SuDs): 29.84 dph.

Details of Previous Committee / Resolutions and any member site visit: Outline Planning Permission ref: DC/18/04773 approved by Committee, subject to conditions, on 13th March 2019.

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

Has the application been subject to Pre-Application Advice: Yes - Ref: DC/19/02966 - August 2019.

PART ONE – REASON FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE

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

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
CS01 - Settlement Hierarchy
CS05 - Mid Suffolk's Environment
CS09 - Density and Mix
GP01 - Design and layout of development
HB01 - Protection of historic buildings
HB08 - Safeguarding the character of conservation areas
CL02 - Development within special landscape areas
CL08 - Protecting wildlife habitats
T09 - Parking Standards
T10 - Highway Considerations in Development

Neighbourhood Plan Status

This application site is within a Neighbourhood Plan Area. The Neighbourhood Plan is currently adopted by the LPA. Accordingly, the Neighbourhood Plan has Significant weight,

Neighbourhood Plan policies most relevant in consideration if the current application are:

HAU1 - Haughley Spatial Strategy
HAU5 - Land at West of Fishponds Way
HAU10 - Development Design and Character
HAU14 - Protection of the Rural Landscape
HAU15 - Rights of Way and Access
CND5 - Fishponds Way Footpath
CND7 - Haughley Traffic Calming and Safety

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)

Haughley Parish Council – 19th Dec. 2019 – Supports the application – Comments:

- 1) PC should be consulted and given the opportunity to consider removal of hedgerow(s) to install the new footpath;
- 2) Consideration is made for the footbridge over the River Gipping;

- 3) PC should be given the opportunity to discuss taking over the Management of the open space for a commuted sum.

Haughley Parish Council – 22nd Jan. 2020 – Continue to Support this application – Repeat comments made as part of previous response dated 19th December 2019.

Old Newton with Dagworth and Gipping Parish Council – 26th Dec. 2019 – Comments received:

- 1) Development densely packed;
- 2) Only 2 designated parking spaces per dwelling;
- 3) Uniformity estate house feel – very modern when compared to some neighbouring cottages – Design is boring – nothing bespoke or different to designs;
- 4) Wish to see colour washed render cottages with roof dormers;
- 5) Aesthetics disappointing compared to the rest of the village;
- 6) Footpath and pedestrian crossing should be forthcoming;
- 7) Traffic consideration will need to be considered within the site and emphasis not to overspill onto the busy road;
- 8) Construction development traffic has to be managed;
- 9) Infrastructure is insufficient for the schooling and health provision for the number of potential residents.

Old Newton with Dagworth and Gipping Parish Council – 28th Jan. 2020 – Nothing new to add – Previous comments remain unchanged.

National Consultee (Appendix 4)

Highways England – 12th Dec. 2019 – Offer no objection – Highways Act Section 175B is not relevant to this application – This proposal is unlikely to have a severe affect upon the strategic Road Network.

Highways England – 15th Jan. 2020 – The updated amendments are unlikely to have any further impact on the strategic road network. Our previous response may, therefore, remain in place.

Natural England – 11th Dec. 2019 – No Objection – Based on the plans submitted, Natural England considers that the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on statutorily protected nature conservation sites or landscapes.

Natural England – 20th Jan. 2020 – The proposed amendments are unlikely to have significantly different impacts on the natural environment than the original proposal.

Anglian Water – 9th Dec. 2019 – Access required for sewage pumping station – Dwellings should be sited 15 metres or more away from pumping station(s) – Catchment Water Recycling Centre currently does not have capacity to treat projected flows – Anglian Water are obligated to accept the foul flows from the development with the benefit of planning consent and would, therefore, take the necessary steps to ensure that there is sufficient treatment capacity should permission be granted.

Anglian Water – 15th Jan. 2020 – Do not wish to make further comments from the new documents provided dated 13/01.

The Environment Agency – 27th Jan. 2020 – Proposal falls under Local Flood Risk Standing advice.

NHS-Suffolk – 12th Dec. 2019 – No developer contributions requested.

NHS-Suffolk – 28th Jan. 2020 – Will not be requesting any CIL funding for this planning application.

County Council Responses (Appendix 5)

SCC-Local Highway Authority – 20th Jan. 2020 – No objection – Subject to compliance with suggested conditions.

SCC-Travel Plan Officer – 5th Dec. 2019 – No comment to make.

SCC-Travel Plan Officer – 14th Jan. 2020 – No comment to make on the additional information submitted.

SCC-Local Lead Flood Authority – 10th Dec. 2019 – Holding objection – A hybrid SuDs system is proposed which is contrary to national and local policy/guidance and there is insufficient detail about the planting and establishment detail of the SuDs features. Actions required to overcome current objection:-

1. Revised surface water drainage strategy utilising a full SuDs system or;
 - a. Provide a viability assessment demonstrating why a full SuDs system cannot be utilised for this site;
2. Cross sectional drawings of all surface water drainage assets;
3. CDM designers risk assessment for the detention basin;
4. Planting details for all SuDs assets;
5. Demonstrate how the detention basin will be established prior to be put into use.

SCC-Local Lead Flood Authority – 7th Jan. 2020 – Maintain Holding Objection – Viability statement on the use of a hybrid SuDs system does not conclusively rule out the above ground full SuDs system – Consider various SuDs components available to a designer, in accordance with national policy – Wet bench width of basin is not acceptable – Freeboard allowance has been incorrectly stated - Actions required to overcome current objection:-

1. Revised surface water drainage strategy utilising a full SuDs system or;
 - b. Provide a viability assessment demonstrating why a full SuDs system cannot be utilised for this site;
2. Cross sectional drawings of all surface water drainage assets.

SCC-Local Lead Flood Authority – 20th Jan. 2020 – Maintain Holding Objection – Applicant is proposing a hybrid SuDs system rather than a full SuDs system – Advise applicant should explore options for a full SuDs system – Consider proposal needs to demonstrate acceptability against NPPF Para. 165 – Density of development and space allocation for open SuDs features shall be decided by the local planning authority.

SCC-Local Lead Flood Authority – 28th Jan. 2020 – Please see previous consultation reply.

SCC-Fire and Rescue – 15th Jan. 2020 – Request that Condition 18 of the Outline Permission, requiring Fire Hydrants is reiterated as part of any reserved matters permission.

SCC-Archaeology – 28th Jan. 2020 – Archaeology works still outstanding – advise archaeology conditions attached to outline permission should be carried over to secure post excavation work and the further work required.

SCC-Development Contributions – 9th Dec. 2019 – If planning permission is granted for the reserved matters application this must be subject to the completed planning obligation secured as part of outline permission ref: DC/18/04773.

SCC-Development Contributions – 17th Jan. 2020 – Previous comments still stand – No further comments to make in respect of the re-consultation.

SCC-Public Rights of Way (PROW) – 7th Feb. 2020 – Acceptance of the proposal based on the understanding that the applicant is working with MSDC Development Management Department to provide a safe walking and cycling link. There are currently no PROW's within or adjacent to the development site.

Internal Consultee Responses (Appendix 6)

MSDC-Ecology Consultants – Place Services – 24th Dec. 2019 – No objection subject to minor amendment to planting scheme, biodiversity enhancements and wildlife sensitive lighting design scheme:

- 1) Recommend mixed native species hedgerow in double staggered row, preferably 5 plants per linear metre, of a mix as suggested;
- 2) Advice given re: discharge of other conditions imposed by way of outline PP.

MSDC-Ecology Consultants – Place Services – 28th Jan. 2020 – No objection subject to compensation for loss of Priority hedgerow habitat, biodiversity enhancements and a wildlife sensitive lighting design scheme.

MSDC-Landscape Consultants – Place Services – 17th Jan. 2020 – Recommend boundary treatments fronting public realm are brick walls rather than close board fencing and a made footpath alongside the woodland boundary – Recommend additional conditions to be attached to any approval.

MSDC-Heritage – 27th Dec. 2019 – The proposal would cause no harm to the designated heritage assets because the proposal would have no discernible impact due to the distance and intervening development between the proposed buildings and heritage assets.

MSDC-Heritage – 21st Jan. 2020 – Latest amendments would not result in any change to the setting of any heritage assets – Please continue to refer to previous heritage comments.

MSDC-Environmental Protection – Land Contamination – 20th Dec. 2019 – No comments to make with respect to land contamination.

MSDC-Environmental Protection – Land Contamination – 14th Jan. 2020 – No comments to make with respect to land contamination.

MSDC-Environmental Protection – Air Quality – 3rd Jan. 2020 – No comments to make with respect to Local Air Quality Management as the submitted documents do not relate to that subject area.

MSDC-Environmental Protection – Air Quality – 14th Jan. 2020 – No objections to the proposed development from the perspective of air quality.

MSDC-Environmental Protection – Other Issues – 12th Dec. 2019 – No objections in principle to the appearance, layout or scale of the site – Subject to conditions being imposed during the site clearance and construction phase of development.

MSDC-Environmental Protection – Other Issues – 23rd Jan. 2020 – No further comments to make in addition to previous comments submitted on 12 December 2019.

MSDC-Environmental Management – Sustainability – 30th Dec. 2019 – Nothing to add to comments submitted previously with regards outline application – Advise consideration should be given with regards electric vehicle charging provision.

MSDC-Environmental Management – Sustainability – 20th Jan. 2020 – Nothing to add to original response of 30th December 2019.

MSDC-Public Realm – 17th Dec. 2019 – No objections in principle to public open space proposed – advise local management solution for maintenance is established.

MSDC-Public Realm – 17th Jan. 2020 – No additional comments to make – Welcome Haughley PC's interest in managing the open spaces on completion.

MSDC-Communities – 29th Jan. 2020 – Concur with Public Realm's comments.

MSDC-Waste Management – 23rd Dec. 2019 – No objection subject to:

- 1) The development being suitable for a 32 tonne Refuse Collection Vehicle (RCV) to manoeuvre around the site;
- 2) Presentation points for waste and recycling bins must be at the edge of each property curtilage unless advised differently

MSDC-Waste Management – 27th Jan. 2020 – No objection subject to: previous comments made.

MSDC-Strategic Housing – 24th Jan. 2020 – Proposed development should offer 35% affordable housing – this is reflected in the S106 agreement attached to the outline planning permission – Confirmation of what dwellings are proposed for affordable rent and what are proposed for shared ownership still required – Preference is for Bungalows on the site, however, no bungalows are proposed.

B: Representations

At the time of writing this report at least 3 letters/emails/online comments have been received. It is the officer opinion that this represents 3 objections. A verbal update shall be provided as necessary.

Views are summarised below:-

- The proposed density is in excess of the suggested limit of 50 by the SHELAA and 55 dwellings in the Neighbourhood Plan;
- Question whether the existing hedgerow fronting Fishponds Way will be replaced or retained;
- The existing dead Elms are covered in Ivy, are a valuable habitat, and should be preserved;
- Careful management required with regards adjacent woodland and Ecological impact;
- Existing Trees act as a screen and any replacement trees should be of the same height as the existing ones and be planted in the same position, in the interest of neighbouring amenity;
- Proposed location of dwellings close to the road frontage is out of character for this part of Haughley;
- Would like to ensure traffic calming measures indicated at outline stage are implemented;
- Concern with regards construction working hours agreed and impact this will have on neighbouring amenity;
- Concern with regards potential flood risk issues.

(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/18/04773	Outline Planning Application (Access to be considered) - Erection of up to 65no. dwellings including means of access into the site (not internal roads), parking, pedestrian / cycle bridge and associated highway works	DECISION: GTD 02.05.2019
REF: 0322/88/OL	Residential development of 7.5 acres of land with dedication of adjacent land as open space, and construction of access.	DECISION: REF 30.09.1988

PART THREE – ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION

1. The Site and Surroundings

- 1.1. The proposal site extends to approximately 5.11 hectares and lies to the south west of Fishponds Way, at the southern edge of the Village of Haughley.
- 1.2. The site comprises an existing open green field bounded: to the north east by the Fishponds Way highway and fronting hedgerow; to the south and south west by woodland and a stream; to the west by the village sewage works and to the north and north west by existing dwellings fronting Fishponds Way. Site levels drop at a moderate rate through the site from Fishponds Way to the Stream to the rear of the site.

- 1.3. The site lies outside the existing village settlement boundary, which runs adjacent to the north-east. Environment agency Flood Zones 2 and 3, and part of the upper Gipping Special Landscape Area, lie to the south boundary of the site, outside the proposed development area. Haughley Sewage Works lies adjacent to the west and the western portion of the site (proposed for Public Open Space) is included within a Cordon Sanitaire. The village Conservation Area and nearest Grade II listed building lie adjacent to the north-west corner of the site, approximately 150 metres from the proposed development area. A belt of Trees and Hedgerows, protected by a Tree Preservation Order lies at the south-east bottom corner of the site, fronting Fishponds Way. Protected Species, including Otters and Watervoles have been reported in and around the stream and woodland to the south of the site. The fronting Highway, Fishponds Way, is speed limited to 30mph, a speed limit which commences from the bridge to the south-east of the site.

2. The Proposal

- 2.1. The application is submitted further to outline planning permission ref: DC/18/04773, granted on 2nd May 2019, and seeks approval of reserved matters relating to the Layout, Scale, Appearance and Landscaping of 65 no. dwellings.
- 2.2. The application proposes delivery of 43 market housing units and 22 affordable housing units, as well as well as approximately 1.9 hectares of Public Space and a Local Equipped Area for Play. The application also proposes extensive additional public footpath connections across the site, connecting the existing village to the site and public open space, and providing a safe footpath and cycle connection between the village and nearby Public Right of Way connections to the south-east of the village. Existing soft landscape planting to the street-scene frontage is proposed to be predominantly retained, although re-planting is required in some locations due to conflict with highway and water infrastructure). A significant amount of additional soft landscape planting is proposed within the green public open space to the western portion of the site. A large surface water attenuation basin is also proposed to the far south-east corner 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 29.84 dwellings per hectare, with back to back distances of no less than 19.7 metres.
- 2.4. The proposed dwellings would all be two-storey in height and the proposed bedroom numbers are broken down as follows:

Market Dwellings

1 Bedroom	= 0 no.
2 Bedroom	= 4 no.
3 Bedroom	= 15 no.
4 Bedroom	= 24 no.
5 Bedroom	= no.

Affordable Dwellings

1 Bedroom	= 4 no.
2 Bedroom	= 12 no.
3 Bedroom	= 6 no

- 2.5. The proposed dwellings would be provided in a range of types and styles. Proposed external facing materials would be a mix of facing red, red-multi and cream brick, from the Forterra range, with some external facing weatherboarded elements in 'Sand' colour. Roofing materials would be

a mix of Terracotta, Tudor Brown, and Black, from the Redland Range. 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 up to 65 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: -

114 no. allocated parking spaces
47 no. Garage spaces
16 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 65 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 in scale and appearance, save for proposed single-storey garage buildings, and 18 no. design variances are proposed.
- 5.2. The layout has been discussed above in part, but is essentially relates to 2 no. branch roads, spurring off the principle access road in either direction, with private drives branching off these in a south-westerly direction and to the north-east, fronting the existing highway. Paved footpaths are also proposed adjacent to the principle estate road, along the frontage of the site, and connecting the village to the proposed public open space and Rural Public Right of Way network to the south-east of the village. The proposed layout is considered to create a welcoming, quality, pedestrian-friendly residential environment. Back gardens predominantly meet side elevations of other dwellings, and opportunity for maximised back to back distances had been taken. Dwellings fronting public open space to the south-west and north-west of the site present active frontages

and avoid unsupervised spaces. The public open space to the west of the site, and landscaped boundary to the south-west, provide green corridors to accord with landscape and ecology 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 to the south-east, and to the north, connecting to villages services and facilities (off site highway works, to provide a connecting footway, and road crossing 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 29.84 dwellings per hectare, although lower than the 40 dph as set out in development plan policy CS9, is considered to be acceptable to the existing character and development density of the village (existing development density of the village is approximately 15 dph).
- 5.4. The layout proposes a range of house types, with 18 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 suitable mix address, and would deliver 22 no. affordable housing units.
- 5.5. Your Strategic Housing Officers have assessed the application proposal and are generally satisfied that the proposed would deliver affordable dwellings of a type that would be acceptable, in accordance with current policy and standards. Your Strategic Housing Officers have, however, required further information with regards the tenure of certain units and have advised a preference for some single-storey affordable units. An acknowledged benefit of the scheme is that it does predominantly meet with Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS).
- 5.6. Your planning officers consider that sufficient information has been provided by the applicant in the form of the proposed layout and detailed plans and elevations to demonstrated that sufficient affordable housing of a number and type required has been proposed. As such, no objection on affordable housing provision is made on the grounds of the proposed layout, scale and appearance of units proposed.

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 south-west and north-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 proposed boundary treatments fronting the public realm (brick walls or soft hedgerow planting is preferred to fences); and the proposed surface treatment to footpaths within the public realm (made surfaces preferred to simple mown footpaths). Your Planning Officers consider an appropriate balance between landscaping and highway visibility has been struck, with a good

scheme of planting being proposed within the public open space to the west of the site, to the countryside edge to the south-west of the site and along the highway frontage to the north-east.

- 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.
- 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 (RSK Land & Development Engineering Ltd.), 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 watercourse, and the proposed layout incorporates attenuation storage in the south-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. 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.
- 8.10. Further to the comments provided by the LLFA, the applicant has produced a surface water drainage viability statement which concludes that the reason surface water infiltration disposal has not been implemented within this site design is due to the low infiltration capacity of the soil as proven by carrying out on-site soakage tests. The test results indicated poor soil permeability, below minimum soakage rates as specified in the Suffolk Surface Water Drainage Guidance document. The applicant states that another reason for no implementing a full SuDs based infiltration design is the groundwater encountered during investigative works and conflict with building regs. requirements and the nearby flood plain that could affect SuDs performance during the wetter months. The applicant states that an additional constraint to providing a full SuDs system is the slope profile of the site and that incorporating above ground SuDs features in a steeply sloped area such as this is not recommended as runoff velocities would likely impact roads and other adjacent features. The inclusion of additional swales along the south-west boundary have also been discounted due to conflict with existing trees, leaf litter and impact on root protection zones. Swales to the north-east site boundary have also been discounted due to conflict with Anglian Water sewage infrastructure.
- 8.11. 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 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 a significant amount of 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 Chief Planning Officer - Sustainable Communities to Grant reserved matters, subject to the following conditions:

- Approved Plans and Documents;
- Revised boundary treatment detail, as recommended by Council Landscape Consultants;
- Advanced Landscape Planting, as recommended by Council Landscape Consultants, to be carried out in the first planting season following commencement of development;

Advisory Note: Compliance with conditions already imposed as part of Outline Planning Permission Ref: DC/18/04773 is also required.