

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL
 PLANNING REFERRALS COMMITTEE - 08 June 2016

AGENDA ITEM NO	1
APPLICATION NO	3563/15
PROPOSAL	Outline planning permission sought for a proposed development comprising up to 280 dwellings; a 60 bed residential care home, the re-provision of a car park for the use of Mulberry Bush Nursery; re-location of existing farm buildings to the west of Parcel 15; and associated infrastructure including roads (including adaptations to Castleton Way and Langton Grove) pedestrian, cycle and vehicle routes, parking, drainage, open spaces, landscaping, utilities and associated earthworks.
SITE LOCATION	Land at Eye Airfield, Castleton Way, Eye
SITE AREA (Ha)	28.7
APPLICANT	Mr Baldwin
RECEIVED	October 2, 2015
EXPIRY DATE	January 29, 2016

REASONS FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE

The application is referred to committee for the following reason:

- (1) it is a "Major" application for:-
- a residential land allocation for 15 or over dwellings

PRE-APPLICATION ADVICE

1. The application follows lengthy dialogue regarding Eye Airfield that has taken place over a number of years and reflects the emerging principles.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

2. The application site is 28.7ha in area and comprises parcel nos. 13, 14 and 15 of Eye Airfield, as identified within the Council's Eye Airfield Development Framework and Eye Airfield Planning Position Statement documents (2013).

Eye Airfield is a disused wartime airfield that lies in the north of the district, northwest of the town of Eye and adjacent to the A140 trunk road 2 miles south of the junction with the A143 and the border with South Norfolk District Council. The town of Diss lies further northwest.

The Airfield is readily accessible by road from the A140, the main highway that connects Ipswich to Norwich. Twelve miles to the south, the A140 links to the A14, which is the main road connecting the port of Felixstowe to Cambridge and the Midlands. 2 miles to the north the A140 links to the A143, which connects the site to Diss, Bury St Edmunds and Lowestoft.

2.

The application site is presently agricultural in nature, notwithstanding natural landscaping features that demarcate individual fields, and abuts the north-western corner of the Eye settlement boundary. The site is generally clear and open, save for some existing agricultural buildings in the north-eastern corner.

Presently only one formal vehicular access serves the site through Langton Grove, which is to the north-east and connects to the B1077 as it becomes Victoria Hill and runs parallel to the eastern boundary of the application site. Other access points are presently provided through internal Airfield roads/tracks to the north and west.

Existing residential development bounds both the southern and eastern site boundaries. Topographically the site generally sits at the lowest point of the Airfield, however due to gently undulating levels some parts of the site are more readily apparent from the public realm than others.

A number of land designations and constraints are relevant to this application. A cluster of listed buildings (Grade II) are within proximity to the north-east and the Eye Conservation Area is approximately 150m to the south. The application site is within Flood Zone 1 and an Area of Archaeological Interest lies to the west of the site. Details relating to the nearby gas compressor station are considered later in this report.

HISTORY

3. The planning history relevant to the application site is:

1658/15	Formal request for a screening opinion for the erection of 290 Dwellings, new internal road Layout, parking, open space, landscaping and associated infrastructure	01/09/2015
0713/13	Upgrade and formation of permanent entrance to Castleton Way, Eye including the widening of existing site tracks.	Granted 20/06/2013
3736/11	Erection and operation of two wind turbine generators (to a maximum tip height of 130m), construction of associated hard standings, temporary access tracks and substation compound.	Granted 29/02/2012
3327/09	Scoping Opinion request under part 4 of the EIA regulations 1999 (proposed wind turbines).	08/12/2009
3294/09	Scoping Opinion - New Chicken Processing Factory	11/12/2009

PROPOSAL

4. The applicant seeks planning permission in outline for the erection of up to 280 no. new dwellings and a 60 no. bed residential care home, together with associated works and infrastructure. The application seeks to establish the principle of development and position(s) of access only, with all other matters

3.

matters' stage. Access to the site is proposed from Castleton Way and Langton Grove and detailed information has been provided in support of this matter.

The indicative masterplan layout presents a 'major' access from Castleton Way which would serve the general bulk of the residential development and exhibits a winding estate road which eventually terminates at an emergency/restricted access toward the north-east of the site.

On the opposite side of this emergency/restricted point, a 'minor' access from Langton Grove is indicated which, having branched from the B1077 and passed a small existing residential development, would serve a smaller estate of dwellings and the care home.

The indicative layout shows a number of areas of open space for the development, including an open 'meadow' and children's play area in the core of the site. A number of pedestrian linkages through the estate and into the existing residential development bounding the site are also shown. The proposals also allow for the re-provision of a car park for the use of the Mulberry Bush Nursery and a re-location of the existing farm buildings within the site.

This application has been revised through amendments/amplifications which have included information in relation to revised ownership certificates/notification, landscape and visual impacts assessment and a revision to the indicative master plan and related development brief. All information received has been subject to at least one additional round of consultation with the relevant interested parties; the latest information being subject to a 10 day period of consultation commencing 24th May 2016. Any responses or representations further to those listed below will be reported through the Addendum Paper and/or verbally at Development Control Committee.

The application documents can be viewed online via the planning pages on the Mid Suffolk District Council website.

POLICY

5. **Planning Policy Guidance**

See Appendix below.

The following documents are also considered as material for the purposes of determining planning applications and are applicable to this proposal:-

Mid Suffolk District Council - Eye Airfield Planning Position Statement (2013).

Mid Suffolk District Council - Eye Airfield Development Framework (2013).

Mid Suffolk District Council (Economy Division) - Land to the South of Eye Airfield: Development Brief (2015).

Cabe at Design Council - Building for Life 12 (3rd Edition, 2015).

Department for Transport - Manual for Streets (2014).

Suffolk County Council - Suffolk Guidance for Parking (2014, adopted 2015).

On the 6th March 2014, a number of Ministerial planning circulars were cancelled by central Government and were replaced by the Government's online Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). The guidance provided is advice on procedure rather than explicit policy, but has been taken into account in reaching the recommendation made on this application.

The PPG is an online reference and is available at the following internet address: www.planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk.

CONSULTATIONS

6. • **Eye Town Council** - Objects; Responses summarised and italicised where directly quoted, as follows:

10th November 2015 (including Planning Application Appraisal dated 4th November 2015)

"Over the last year the Town Council has taken a constructive role in the development proposals for this site. This involvement has included chairing/participating in place-shaping meetings, supporting an exhibition run by Pegasus in December 2014, organising a public event in March 2015 attended by Pegasus and MSDC and a Saturday public information event supported by MSDC. In addition, members of the town Council have met with Pegasus sometimes in conjunction with MSDC officers. In summary, the Town Council has taken a very active and constructive role in the development of proposals that would have a dramatic impact on Eye, its people, services and surroundings. This single development represents a growth of some 30% in the population of the Town.

The Town Council, and indeed many people in the Town, see development as necessary to ensure a sustainable future for Eye. The decision to object does not reflect a general opposition to development but arises specifically from the inadequacies of the application itself."

- The application was registered and consultation carried out prior to the adoption of the development brief.
- Concern that only an outline application has been submitted; further details should be provided.
- Inadequate public consultation and engagement following changes to proposal/inclusion of care home.
- There is no policy justification for the care home.
- Scale of care home unacceptable and question as to whether it would be sited within HSE exclusion zone.
- Highway issues and concern over additional traffic pressures.
- Concern over capacity of local services and the health centre.
- 35% affordable housing is welcomed, however the care home should not be included in this provision.
- No objective assessment has been carried out for the scale or mix of housing proposed.
- Concern over design.
- Concern of impacts upon the historic environment.
- Will the development consider impacts upon climate change?

5.

- Open space is welcomed however increased landscaping to boundaries is needed.
- No bin spaces are shown, nor are electric car charging points.
- Cumulative impacts would be severe.
- A comprehensive traffic assessment is required.
- Suggested improvements relating to footways and ecology.
- Need for broadband provision.
- Need for an adequate Travel Plan.
- Concern over management of open space and play equipment.
- Concern for listed buildings adjacent.
- Flood/drainage concerns.

19th November 2015

"Eye Town Council is concerned that the formal consultation on planning application 3563/15 closed before Mid Suffolk District Council had considered and agreed a design brief for the site. This concern has been compounded by the planning application reserving nearly all matters. The process of dealing with planning matters for this site appears flawed."

- The design brief should be considered and adopted before the application.
- Further details of the development should be requested from the applicant.
- Concern over sudden inclusion of care home and concern over its need.
- Concerns over traffic impacts.
- An open-book approach in terms of viability assessment should be undertaken.
- **Suffolk County Council (Developer Contributions)** - Comments and recommendations; the following financial contributions are required:
 - Education** - £1,768,253
 - Pre-school provision** - £170,548
 - Libraries** - £60,480
- **Suffolk County Council (Archaeology)** - No objection; subject to condition(s) relating to an appropriate scheme of investigation prior to development.
- **Suffolk County Council (Rights of Way and Access)** - No objection; comments.
- **Suffolk County Council (Fire & Rescue)** - No objection; comments that fire hydrants are required, quantum dependent upon reserved matters.
- **Suffolk County Council (Landscape Development)** - No objection; recommend conditions.
- **Suffolk County Council (Local Highway Authority)** - No objection; subject to a suite of recommended highways improvements and contributions through condition and s106 agreement (see relevant section below).
- **Suffolk County Council (Floods & Water)** - No specific objection, however greater details required under RM; a condition requiring an appropriate drainage scheme is requested.

6.

- **Corporate Manager - Sustainable Environment (Land Contamination)** - No objection; subject to standard contamination condition and advisory note.
- **Corporate Manager - Public Realm (Arboriculture)** - No objection; recommend condition.
- **Corporate Manager - Strategic Housing** - No objection; the viability appraisal submitted has been scrutinised, which offers 20% affordable housing provision or 56 no. dwellings of a total of 280 no. maximum. On that basis, the following mix would be acceptable:

Affordable rent tenancy - 25 no.

Shared ownership - 15 no.

Starter homes - 16 no.

- **Historic England** - as follows:

9th November 2015

"We are not able to fully assess the impacts of the proposals on the nearby heritage assets, namely Eye Castle, St Peter and St Paul's Church, the Eye Conservation Area and the undesignated heritage asset of Eye Airfield. Additional viewpoint information and some basic massing photomontages are required to satisfy paragraph 128 of the NPPF, and to fully determine whether or not there will be harm in terms of paragraph 132 of the NPPF. If, following this information, there is any harm, the Council should weigh it against the public benefit that would be delivered, in accordance with paragraph 134 of the NPPF. We wish to be re-consulted following submission of this information."

2nd March 2016

"The proposed development could result in harm to the significance of Eye Castle scheduled monument, Eye Conservation Area, the Grade I-listed Church of St Peter and St Paul, and the undesignated heritage asset of Eye Airfield, by inappropriate development in their setting in terms of paragraphs 132 and 134 of the NPPF. The Council should therefore weigh any public benefit delivered by the development against the harm as stated in paragraph 134 before determining the application."

- **Ministry of Defence** - No objection; outside of safeguarding area.
- **Environment Agency** - No objection; subject to conditions relating to contamination.
- **Anglian Water** - No objection; recommend conditions and comments relating to surface water drainage and foul sewerage.
- **Suffolk Wildlife Trust** - No objection; recommend conditions.
- **NHS England** - No objection; subject to securing a developer contribution of £100,380.
- **National Grid** - Holding objection; due to the proximity of the development to a gas pipeline and associated assets.

LOCAL AND THIRD PARTY REPRESENTATIONS

7. Those responses received during the consultation exercises that have been carried out (including representations from the Suffolk Preservation Society) are summarised and italicised where directly quoted, below:-

- Buffer zone is vague.
- Care home is not needed.
- Care home is too big (three storeys).
- Traffic concerns relating to re-positioned car park.
- Existing drainage issues.
- Existing flood and foul sewage issues.
- Harm to Eye Conservation Area.
- Harm to listed buildings.
- Negative landscape impacts.
- Increased traffic pressures.
- Damage to sensitive archaeology.
- Application does not reflect public consultation.
- Improvements to existing highway infrastructure are required.
- Better employment uses could be provided.
- Have HSE been consulted?
- The development falls within the blast zones of the compressor site.
- 280 dwellings pose a disproportionate growth to the town.
- Why was the care home added at the last minute?
- The development brief should inform the detailed design.
- Ecology concerns.
- A 15% increase to the housing stock in Eye is unacceptable.
- Concern that Pegasus have held 'private' talks with the Council.
- Concern over loss of agricultural land.
- Concern over pressure on healthcare provision.
- Privacy concerns.
- Construction disturbance/damage concerns.
- Highway safety concerns.
- A varied housing mix is needed.
- Concern with comments submitted by Anglian Water.
- A significant package of mitigation measures should be secured.
- Development will increase potential for flooding.
- More affordable housing units should be provided.
- Only one access is poor planning.
- Schools are oversubscribed.
- Not enough jobs are available in the area.
- There are not enough services or facilities in the town to support the development.
- Pollution concerns.
- Development here is positive but should be of a reduced scale.
- Unwelcome urbanisation.
- Insufficient details provided.
- A proposed population increase to the town of 25%-50% is ridiculous.
- The parish plan has not been considered.
- The application has been rushed through without proper consultation.
- Development will pollute adjacent watercourses.

Suffolk Preservation Society - Objects:

8.

- The site is greenfield which has generally been in constant agricultural use.
- It is surprising that the application has been submitted prior to the adoption of the development brief which nullifies the previous public engagement work.
- The indicative layout is of a poor quality.
- Lack of integrated green infrastructure.
- Concern of a single 'primary' access.
- Concern of archaeological impacts.
- Concern over lack of detail provided.
- Traffic/highway safety concerns.
- Concern over impacts of care home.
- Concern regarding heritage impacts.
- The DAS is deficient in the information and justification for the development.

The consultee responses and representations received to date have been noted and have been taken into account when reaching the recommendations as set out below.

ASSESSMENT

8. From an assessment of the relevant planning policies, supplementary guidance, site history and constraints/designations, those representations and consultation responses received and other material planning considerations, the main issues in determining this application are considered, as following:-

- **The Principle of Development;**
- **Housing Need;**
- **Heritage;**
- **Connectivity - Highway Safety and Sustainable Transport;**
- **Impact on the Landscape;**
- **Design and Layout;**
- **Resilience to Climate Change (Flood Risk/Drainage and Building Performance/Renewable Energy);**
- **Impact upon Residential Amenity;**
- **Other Matters, including; Safeguarding from Major Accidents, Land Contamination, Crime and Disorder, Biodiversity and Protected Species, Archaeology, and Environmental Impact Assessment;**
- **Planning Obligations, Viability and Affordable Housing;**
- **Planning Balance and Conclusion.**

The Principle of Development

Local Planning Policy and Guidance

Policy CS1 of the CS sets out the overall settlement policy for the district. It states that the majority of new development (including retail, employment and housing allocations) will be directed to towns and key service centres, where Eye is specifically identified.

Policy CS2 states that development in areas outside of defined settlements, in the countryside, will be restricted to certain criteria including new-build

employment generating proposals where there is a strategic, environmental or operational justification.

Policy CS8 and Policy FC2 of the CSFR highlight the provision made for allocating greenfield sites and associated infrastructure in Mid Suffolk over a plan period to terminate 2027 and provides a guide for the need to boost housing supply, sustainably, within the District. The policies advise that in relation to the *broad* distribution and phasing of housing allocations over the CS plan period, *over 200 houses are allocated to Eye with a primary focus on greenfield land as 'urban extensions'*.

Framing the above, the Eye Airfield Development Framework (EADF) and Eye Airfield Planning Position Statement (PPS) were adopted in February and November 2013 respectively. Whilst the PPS is a non-statutory planning guidance document, it nonetheless provides a framework for sustainable growth that is consistent with the development plan and should therefore be afforded weighting in the decision-taking process, where the principles within have been shaped through public engagement and have been democratically approved.

The PPS, which condenses and clarifies the Council's position as a step forward from the EADF, assess and demonstrates the application site's development potential in accordance with national planning policy where a positive conclusion is reached. The intention of this document, as explicitly stated, is to assist with and form the basis of, the production of a detailed site allocations document appropriate to bringing forward development at Eye Airfield.

Whilst such a local plan document is yet to be produced or formally adopted, it is considered that there is evidently a presumption in favour of sustainable development on the site that is framed by the weight of adopted development plan policy.

Eye Airfield Development Brief

In order to shape future development proposals on the site, the applicant has produced a development brief (with community engagement in its preparation) for the land to the south of Eye Airfield; the land that is subject to this planning application. In the pursuit of this aim, it is recommended that subsequent planning applications for the development of the site should be substantially in accordance with the provisions of that brief; this can be achieved through a s106 legal agreement.

National Planning Policy and '5-year Land Supply'

Notwithstanding the above local policy context, the Council as Local Planning Authority cannot presently demonstrate that it has a 5-year land supply of deliverable housing sites.

In accordance with paragraphs 47 and 49 of the NPPF, local planning authorities are required to significantly boost housing supply. Where a local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, "*relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date*".

Paragraph 197 of the NPPF states that in assessing and determining development proposals, local planning authorities should apply the presumption

in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread that runs through the planning system (see Para. 14).

In this regard, paragraph 14 further states that:

“For decision-taking this means:

- *approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and*
- *where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, granting permission unless:*
 - *any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or,*
 - *specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.”*

Paragraph 7 of the NPPF sets out that there are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental, and that these roles are mutually dependent and should be jointly sought to achieve sustainable development.

In light of this, as the development plan is considered out of date in terms of the Council's housing supply policies, it is necessary to consider that, nevertheless, the NPPF requires that development be sustainable and assess whether the adverse impacts outweigh the benefits when considered in the whole.

With reference to paragraph 49, Members should note the recent judgment in *Suffolk Coastal District Council v Hopkins Homes - [2016] EWCA Civ 168*, where the comments of Lindblom LJ raise a number of points that are of relevance to the determination of this application.

Firstly, it is clear that a more purposive approach to the interpretation of *“Relevant policies for the supply of housing”* (para. 49 of the NPPF) should be taken, where the scope of policies deemed to be for the supply of housing can include not just those worded specifically to that end, but *“any by which a material degree of restraint [is] placed on the location and supply of new housing”* (para. 53 of the above judgment).

At para. 47 of that judgment, Lindblom LJ states the following:

“One may, of course, infer from paragraph 49 of the NPPF that in the Government's view the weight to be given to out-of-date policies for the supply of housing will normally be less than the weight due to policies that provide fully for the requisite supply. The weight to be given to such policies is not dictated by government policy in the NPPF. Nor is it, nor could it be, fixed by the court. It will vary according to the circumstances, including, for example, the extent to which

II.

relevant policies fall short of providing for the five-year supply of housing land, the action being taken by the local planning authority to address it, or the particular purpose of a restrictive policy – such as the protection of a "green wedge" or of a gap between settlements. There will be many cases, no doubt, in which restrictive policies, whether general or specific in nature, are given sufficient weight to justify the refusal of planning permission despite their not being up-to-date under the policy in paragraph 49 in the absence of a five-year supply of housing land".

On that basis, your Officers consider that the contribution that this site would make to the supply of housing should be given due weighting, especially where the policies identified above would be applicable to paragraph 49. In this respect, and noting that paragraph 47 of the NPPF states that "*applications for housing should be considered in the context of sustainable development*", it is considered that the proposed development is acceptable in principle, subject to assessment against other material planning considerations and the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Housing Need

Policies CS9, H14 and FC2 state that the mix and type of housing development is expected to reflect the established needs in the Mid Suffolk District. Policy H4 relates to the provision of affordable homes and states that in order to promote inclusive and mixed communities residential schemes will be required to provide 35% affordable housing.

Policy FC1.1 relates to implementing sustainable development and contains a number of principles against which proposals for development should be judged and states that development must respect the local context and character of different parts of the District and address the key issues and contribution that they make to the objectives of the Core Strategy in relation to housing need.

In addition to the above planning policies, planning policy and housing delivery has been constantly evolving at a national level. The Government's present objectives are aimed towards improving housing delivery and the supply of housing in line with need. The recent Housing and Planning Bill introduced on the 13th October 2015 (attaining royal assent, 12th May 2016) is building upon an approach where local planning authorities should be flexible in meeting housing need to ensure delivery.

In respect of this outline planning application the following assessment is made of the scheme against the above planning policies and housing need:-

- All matters are reserved with the exception of access on the outline planning application; consequently the indicative sketch plan is for illustrative purposes and only serves therefore to show that the amount and scale of development can be delivered on the site.
- Delivery of up to 280 no. dwellings and a 60 no. bedroom care home; the proposal would have inherent social and economic benefits and would meet housing need and delivery of growth.
- A significant affordable housing provision (20% on site units); due to viability constraints not all recent developments have been able to deliver a provision

in terms of affordable housing and this factor therefore weighs in favour of the proposal.

- Delivery of 60 no. care home units; this meets a significant demographic need, both locally and within the District.

In conclusion, the scheme is acceptable in terms of meeting housing need when viewed against the development plan and the needs of the District. The proportion of affordable housing in the scheme is considered to be reasonable having regard to viability constraints, which will be considered later in this report.

Heritage

With reference to the treatment of the submitted application, the Council acknowledges its statutory duties and responsibilities, notably; Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which requires the Local Planning Authority to have "*special regard to the desirability of preserving [a] building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses*"; and Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which requires the Local Planning Authority to pay "*special attention...to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that [conservation] area.*"

The NPPF sets out the Government's national planning policy for the conservation of the historic environment and builds upon the 1990 Act referred to above. Paragraphs 132-134 state inter alia that when considering the impact of works or development upon the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation; any harm requires clear and convincing justification. Where works will lead to harm to significance, Local Planning Authorities should refuse permission unless it can be demonstrated that the harm is necessary to achieve public benefits that outweigh that harm.

Following recent legal judgments, it is understood that whilst the assessment of likely harm to designated heritage assets is a matter for its own planning judgement, the Local Planning Authority is required to give any such harm considerable importance and weight; as confirmed in the case of *Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Ltd v (1) East Northamptonshire District Council, (2) English Heritage, (3) National Trust and (4) Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government [2014] EWCA Civ 137*.

Whilst matters relating to scale, layout, appearance and landscaping are not for consideration at this stage, the indicative details provided by the applicant which have included a revised Landscape and Visual impact Assessment provide the opportunity to make an assessment as to the potential impacts of the development upon the historic environment.

Historic England summarised their most recent views as follows:

"The proposed development could result in harm to the significance of Eye Castle scheduled monument, Eye Conservation Area, the Grade I-listed Church of St Peter and St Paul, and the undesignated heritage asset of Eye Airfield, by inappropriate development in their setting in terms of paragraphs 132 and 134 of the NPPF. The Council should therefore weigh any public benefit delivered by

the development against the harm as stated in paragraph 134 before determining the application."

The high threshold that has been established through case law in relation to identifying 'substantial' harm and the conclusion of Historic England stating that paragraph 134 is applicable leads your Officer to conclude, having had regard for the nature of the development, its surrounding environs and the heritage comments received, that any harm posed by the development would be '*less than substantial*' within the meaning provided by the NPPF.

With no detailed plans to consider at this stage the likelihood of such harm being posed by the development is a matter of debate. However the potential prominence of the care home and subsequent disturbance of views afforded from historic sites, is noted. It is, however, considered that a high quality and design-led scheme could mitigate the potential impacts of the proposal upon the historic environment due to the topography of the site and its relationship to existing built development. Should Members be minded to approve this application, it is further considered that an adoption by a developer of those principles contained within the Development Brief would serve to reinforce this.

Nonetheless, and where it is still considered that the proposal would pose less than substantial harm to the setting and wider appreciation of listed building(s) and Eye Conservation Area, the NPPF requires that such harm be balanced against the public benefits of the proposal.

In this instance, the public benefits of the proposal can be summarised as including the following:-

- Delivery of up to 280 no. dwellings and a 60 no. bedroom care home; the proposal would have inherent social and economic benefits and would meet housing need and delivery of economic growth.
- A significant affordable housing provision (20% on site units); due to viability constraints not all recent developments have been able to deliver a provision in terms of affordable housing and this factor therefore weighs in favour of the proposal.
- Delivery of 60 no. care home units; this meets a clear demographic need, both locally and within the District.
- Public open space and play equipment delivery with connectivity to existing residential development.
- A suite of infrastructure contributions including off-site support to local open space.

Considered in isolation, it is unlikely that these public benefits would be sufficient to outweigh the potential harm that has been identified.

However, it is considered that in combination these public benefits are sufficient to outweigh the potential "*less than substantial harm*" to the designated heritage assets identified, even when considerable importance and weight is given to the desirability of preserving those relevant designated heritage assets.

Officers have therefore applied the balance required by paragraph 134 of the NPPF, having special regard to the desirability of preserving the historic environment as required by the Listed Buildings Act and given the harm considerable importance and weight. The outcome of this balancing exercise is that those public benefits identified outweigh the less than substantial harm, even when that harm is given considerable importance and weight.

A positive recommendation in relation to heritage impacts can therefore be made having regard to the development plan, other material planning considerations including the NPPF, and imposed statutory duties and responsibilities.

Connectivity - Highway Safety and Sustainable Transport

Paragraph 32 of the NPPF states that proposals must provide safe and suitable access for all and that transport networks should be improved in a cost effective way to limit any significant impact of the development on the surrounding area. Paragraph 32 also makes it clear that proposals must *only* be refused where residual cumulative impacts on highway safety would be 'severe'.

The key policies to consider from the development plan are T9 and T10 which seek development that is well laid out in terms of site access and highway safety, traffic flow and the environment.

The most recent comments of the Local Highway Authority (LHA) confirm that the development is considered to be acceptable in highway terms, subject to securing an appropriate package of contributions and improvements imposed by planning condition and through a s106 agreement. Having considered the development on its own merits, the following comments are taken directly from the LHA's most recent response:

"There is local concern about the impact on the A140 junctions and although the County Council has similar concerns, a recent corridor study has concluded that in terms of the A140 in this area, the current level of housing development proposed within the next five years is unlikely to greatly affect the performance of the A140/B1077 junction and the A140/Castleton Way junction. The applicant has put forward a development proposal which has been designed with an access strategy in order to reduce the impact on the A140/B1077 junction. The information submitted with this application has demonstrated that there is adequate junction capacity to accommodate this scale of development without specific mitigation and that there is not a serve residual impact in terms of highway capacity.

However, a significant increase in traffic will be expected if development continues on the airfield site as previously envisaged and this will ultimately effect the operation of these junctions in due course. A significant increase in new housing to the south of the airfield will ultimately result in further increase in the number of vehicles using the Castleton Way junction and increase the pressure and safety of this junction. There will be a point when the level of development will require a significant junction improvement scheme to be delivered to allow for the level of growth expected in this area.

This is an outline application and therefore many highway details will require further discussion and agreement in due course. It is considered important that

the applicant implements a full residential Travel Plan in order to maximise potential modal shift and reduce impact on the highway where possible."

On that basis, the following contributions have been recommended and agreed with the applicant in respect of the following highway safety and transport improvements:-

- Town centre - £50,000;
- Primary school - £15,000;
- High school - £10,000;
- Public transport - £37,000;
- Rights of way - £46,150.

Given the scale and nature of development and the potential impacts posed to the local highway network, the agreement of a full Travel Plan is also considered necessary and this has been confirmed and agreed with the applicant. The precise details and associated costs related to the Travel Plan would be known once the precise quantum and mix of development is put forward through the reserved matters stage and can be secured by way of legal agreement.

A number of 'grampian'-style conditions are also requested in order to agree matters relating to and including:-

- Parking, manoeuvring, and cycle storage details
- Parking to be in accordance with adopted standards
- Roundabout access details
- School drop-off and zebra crossing details
- Surface water discharge prevention details
- Estate roads and footpaths details and implementation requirements
- HGV/deliveries management plan

There is no reason to consider that the above details could not be provided to the satisfaction of the LHA or local planning authority at the reserved matters stage or prior to the commencement of development.

With regards to parking, there would be sufficient space at the quantum and density of development proposed to achieve off road parking in accordance with the parking standards. Likewise, there is no inherent reason why a safe internal layout could not be achieved. The detailed layout and design would be dealt with at the reserved matters stage.

The indicative site layout identifies a number of pedestrian links that provide for permeability both through the application site and into existing residential development to the south and east, thereby enabling connectivity from/to the development to/from nearby services.

The Department for Transport's 'Manual for Streets' identifies that "...Walkable neighbourhoods are typically characterised by having a range of facilities within 10 minutes (up to 800m) walking distance of residential areas, which residents may access comfortably on foot".

In relation to this application, there are a range of facilities within this distance including education, healthcare and retail services. Other services are less than a 2km away and are nonetheless considered to be attractive to both pedestrians

and cyclists. The site is, therefore, considered to be well connected to facilities and in this respect represents a sustainable form of development.

In respect of highway safety and connectivity the application is therefore considered favourably.

Notwithstanding the above, Members should be aware that the children's nursery adjacent to the 'minor' access served by Langton Grove is subject to a live planning application that is yet to be determined (1562/16). That application seeks to increase pupil numbers from 58 to 78. Members will be provided with an update as to the status of that application and its potential impact upon this outline scheme at Committee.

Impact on the Landscape

The NPPF states that the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside should be recognised in decisions. Policies GP1 and H15 require development proposals to reflect local characteristics, protect the landscape of the District and state that landscaping should be regarded as an integral part of design.

The application site represents a large area of agricultural land that is presently open and undeveloped (notwithstanding the north-eastern corner of the site). It is inevitable that developing the land would have some impact on the character of the site and its immediate landscape setting. However the development plan envisages that there will be development in such areas, as noted in consideration of the principle of development elsewhere in this report; the key question, having established that the principle of development is acceptable, is whether the visual impact of the development can be reasonably contained or mitigated.

In this instance the applicant has provided an indicative layout which includes perimeter planting for the proposal and indications through the Design and Access Statement that an extensive green infrastructure package can be delivered. The information supplied is considered to be sufficient to enable an assessment to be made against the likely landscape and visual effects of the proposal, with your officers having also made an extensive visit to the application site and its surroundings.

The indicative layout indicates good permeability which would allow for public use of proposed open spaces within the site, which includes a children's play area and a large 'meadow' area at the heart of the development.

Contextually, in views into the site from the surrounding area where available (including from Eye Castle), the development would be seen within the context of the existing developments. Opportunities can be taken to ensure that any existing screened boundaries to the site are retained in their naturalised form and where possible those boundaries can be reinforced and complemented through appropriate planting with additional planting in those areas where screening is limited.

Accordingly the SCC Natural Environment Team (Landscape Development Officer) and the Council's own arboricultural specialist, have raised no objection to the development subject to appropriate conditions. Consequently the development is considered to have an acceptable visual impact on the

landscape.

Design and Layout

Delivering quality urban design is also a core aim of the NPPF which states (at paragraph 56) that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and is indivisible from good planning. At paragraph 64 the NPPF further states that permission should be refused for poor design that fails to take opportunities to improve the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. The NPPF also encourages the use of local design review.

Policies GP1, CS9 and H15 require (*inter alia*) that new development should be well designed and of an appropriate size/scale, density, layout and character in relation to its setting and be well connected to facilities.

This application is submitted in outline where the matters of layout and building design are reserved. However, it is good practice for an applicant to demonstrate that the site can be developed in an acceptable way. To this end the applicant has submitted an indicative layout and a detailed Design and Access Statement along with other details that provide an indication as to how the delivery of the scheme is envisaged.

The Design and Access Statement includes the following reference:-

"Development will accord with the principles of high quality design and best practice to create a townscape that is varied and sympathetic to its environment. The aim must be to achieve a development with a strong identity and distinct sense of place whilst at the same time integrating with the existing community."

The residential development follows a distinct theme; general forms and styles commensurate with the Suffolk vernacular with a palette of materials and variations of scale and form in order to promote visual interest and distinctiveness.

The indicative layout and illustrative details have articulated these principles by showing a simple layout with housing generally facing onto the road or into designated shared spaces which would create a sense of enclosure and natural surveillance. A looped road and 'village street' arrangement would be accommodated around open spaces, providing focal points for the development including the large open 'meadow' area at the heart of the new estate. The simple 'phasing' and arrangement of built areas with permeable links would promote clear legibility.

Policy CS9 of the CS states that housing developments should make the best use of land by achieving densities of at least 30 dwellings per hectare (dph), unless there are "...special local circumstances that require a different treatment." In this instance the moderate density of the development varying between 17 and 35 dph is considered appropriate for this edge of town/urban fringe location, noting especially that in this instance the density of development could be proportionately related to potentially detrimental impacts upon the sensitive environs constraining the site; a lower density would mitigate against this.

The density and indicative layout proposed allows space for soft landscaping

and open spaces and would ensure that the development would not have a cramped appearance; this allows 'garden suburb' principles to be followed, as encouraged in Paragraph 52 of the NPPF. The density/quantum of development also enables the proposal to be of a size which can assimilate into the Eye settlement.

At this stage, a formal Design Review and/or Building for Life assessment has not been undertaken given that the scheme is in outline and it has been demonstrated that it is underpinned by sound urban design principles. These assessments could be undertaken at the reserved matters stage and would be encouraged.

Resilience to Climate Change (Flood Risk/Drainage and Building Performance/Renewable Energy)

The NPPF gives great weight to sustainable development, which is considered to be a 'golden thread' running through the planning system. Adaption to, and resilience against, climate change is a key consideration of sustainable development in the NPPF. This is echoed in the Core Strategy and associated Focused Review, which states that development should be designed to a high standard in terms of its sustainability.

The 'sustainability' of the proposal and its resilience to climate change can be broken down into a number of key issues, such as the accessibility of the proposed development and its design quality (discussed above), the scheme's resilience to climate and social change and the buildings performance. Other important aspects of sustainable development, such as ecology, open space provision and safeguarding heritage are discussed elsewhere in this report.

A key issue when considering 'resilience' is whether the development has been designed to adapt to issues presented by climate change, such as an increased risk of flooding from heavy rain or high energy prices. In this instance the application site is considered to fall within 'Flood Zone 1' and as such there is a very low probability (less than 1 in 1000 annually) of river or sea flooding.

However, due to the scale and residential nature of the proposal a detailed flood risk and drainage assessment/scheme has been submitted. Initial details relating to the management of surface water drainage (SuDS) have also been provided, however it is considered that precise and appropriate details can be secured by way of condition; where an objective assessment could be made based upon the final layout and scale of the development.

Where the application has been made in outline form, details relating to the overall sustainability and energy efficiency of the scheme cannot be objectively determined as this stage. However, such matters can be dealt with at the reserved matters stage when passive solar gain or renewable energy details, for example, can be explored and building performance would be better known at this detailed design stage. Consequently conditions are recommended to secure this in relation to both the residential and employment elements of the development.

Impact upon Residential Amenity

One of the core planning principles within paragraph 17 of the NPPF is that

Local Planning Authorities should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings, and this is also required by policy GP1 of the Local Plan.

The application is in outline with the layout reserved. The proposal is such that there would be sufficient room to ensure residential amenity is safeguarded for existing neighbours and future residents. The indicative layout shows a way that this can be achieved with clear building lines and adequate separation distances between proposed development and the existing properties that bound the application site.

The proximity of the estate road and detailed access points to nearby properties is noted but is not considered a justifiable reason for refusal. Notwithstanding this, the detailed layout of the scheme would be assessed at the reserved matters stage.

Concerns regarding the construction of the development have been noted. It is considered appropriate, as would be standard on most Major schemes, to secure agreed details of a suitable management plan.

OTHER MATTERS

Safeguarding from Major Accidents

The NPPF states at paragraph 172 that planning policies should be based on up-to-date information on the location major hazards and on the mitigation of the consequences of major accidents. Evidently the need to safeguard the public from the potential for major accidents is a key planning principle, which is reinforced by the Control of Major Accidents Hazards (COMAH) Regulations 1999 and 2015 (as amended); due regard has been paid to this consideration.

The application site lies to the south of the Eye Gas Compressor Station, which is located in the centre of the airfield. Given its proximity to the proposed development the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) planning advice for developments near hazardous installations (PADHI) needs to be considered.

Where a site is near to a hazard such as a gas compressor station, the local planning authority has a duty to refer the planning application to the HSE. The HSE will respond that they either 'Advise Against' (AA) or 'Don't Advise Against' (DAA) the granting of planning permission and the planning authority take this into account when making a decision on a planning application. PADHI uses a three-zone system: inner (IZ), middle (MZ) and outer (OZ). The risks and hazards are greatest in the inner zone and the restrictions to development the strictest.

In general, The HSE place stringent limits to hotel, retail, residential and high density employment uses within the inner zone. There are significant limitations for residential, retail and hotel uses in the middle zone too.

Whilst no formal comment has been received from the HSE, the applicant has nonetheless demonstrated through a revised indicative masterplan that the most vulnerable areas of the development would be outside of the OZ, which is the most preferable scenario and one which can be reasonably assumed to maintain the ongoing safety of future residents.

The recent comments of National Grid have been noted and taken into account, where a holding objection is raised on the basis of apparatus being within proximity to the proposed development. Notwithstanding this, the precise layout of the development is a matter reserved for consideration at a later date and there is no reason to consider that the development could not be adequately assimilated to an acceptable degree in this regard, where attention has been paid to the 'assets map' and supporting information contained within the submission of National Grid.

Land Contamination

The Corporate Manager - Sustainable Environment (Land Contamination) and the Environment Agency have not raised any objection to the proposal in this respect, but have requested conditions be attached to ensure the safe development and future occupancy of the site.

Crime and Disorder

Consideration has been given to the provisions of Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act, 1998, in the assessment of this application but the proposal does not raise any significant issues.

Biodiversity and Protected Species

In assessing this application due regard has been given to the provisions of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, in so far as it is applicable to the proposal and the provisions of Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, in relation to protected species. In accordance with those comments received from the Suffolk Wildlife Trust, the application is considered favourably subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions.

Archaeology

As part of the application site lies within an Area of Archaeological Potential, the Suffolk County Council Archaeological team were consulted. It is noted that whilst no objection was raised, the imposition of a planning condition has been requested.

Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

Local planning authorities have a well-established general responsibility to consider the environmental implications of developments which are subject to planning control. Only those projects which are likely to have significant effects upon the environment will require an EIA.

In that respect this application was carefully considered against the relevant Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations.

Taking into account the selection criteria listed under Schedule 3 of those Regulations, a Screening Opinion has been issued (prior to the submission of this application) and it was concluded and advised that no EIA was required for the development proposed.

PLANNING OBLIGATIONS, VIABILITY AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Public open spaces are considered to be key elements of 'major' residential schemes, which accord with those garden suburb principles supported by the NPPF. The indicative layout identifies that a generous provision of such space can be achieved within the proposed development, given the lower density of dwellings per hectare. Play equipment would also be included and this also indicated on that plan. The precise design and layout would be dealt with at the reserved matters stage but obligations are recommended to secure the public open space, the provision of a play area and their ongoing management.

Given the likely pressure of the residential occupation of the scheme upon surrounding public open space in the vicinity, it is considered reasonable to require an obligation of £100,000, which has been agreed by the applicant, in order to support sports/changing facilities and related football pitch drainage in Eye.

Other contributions identified and agreed in negotiation with the applicant include:-

- **Education** - £1,768,253.
- **Pre-school provision** - £170,548.
- **Libraries** - £60,480.
- **NHS England** - £100,380.
- **Affordable Housing as agreed and accepted by the Council's Housing team (20%).**
- **Highway Safety Improvements** - £75,000.
- **Public transport** - £37,000.
- **Rights of way** - £46,150.
- **Travel Plan agreement and appropriate costings.**
- **That subsequent planning applications for the development of the site should be substantially in accordance with the provisions of the development brief.**

To allow for the development of the site over time, bearing in mind the viability of the proposal and the incremental impact that would result as the development progresses, a scheme for the phasing of the payments is proposed as set out below. This includes a date at which a pro-rata amount would be payable if the development has not reached the amount of development expected, such that services can be supported appropriate to the level of development. Such details as set out below have been agreed with the applicant.

Trigger Point	Obligation and Amount
Not later than occupation of the 25 th dwelling.	Education - 25% Pre-School - 50% NHS England - £25,000 Public Transport - 100%; subject to clawback if not spent within 5 years. Highway Safety Improvements - 100%.

Not later than occupation of the 125th dwelling, or on a pro rata basis 24 months from commencement of development.	Education - 25% Pre-School - 50% NHS England - £25,000 Libraries - £20,840 Public Rights of Way - 100% to be allocated across the three identified projects as necessary; subject to clawback if not spent within 5 years. Sports facilities/pitch drainage in Eye - £50,000.
Not later than occupation of the 175th dwelling, or on a pro rata basis 48 months from commencement of development.	Education - 25% NHS England - £25,000 Libraries - £40,000 Sports facilities/pitch drainage in Eye - £50,000.
Not later than occupation of the 225th dwelling, or on a pro rata basis 60 months from commencement of development.	Education - 25% NHS England - £25,380

The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations (2010) state that after 6 April 2015 no more than five s106 obligations can be 'pooled' for the funding or provision of an infrastructure project or type of infrastructure. The Regulations require that s106 obligations must be specific and identify the infrastructure project that the contribution will fund.

In accordance with those Regulations, the obligations recommended to be secured by way of a planning obligation deed are (a) necessary to make the Development acceptable in planning terms (b) directly related to the Development and (c) fairly and reasonably relate in scale and kind to the Development.

The entirety of the application site lies within the Eye Airfield Strategic Site identified in the MSDC CIL Charging Schedule (2016). Development within Strategic Sites pays £0 CIL and instead delivers necessary infrastructure and other mitigation through a s106 legal agreement. Therefore the development is not liable for a charge under the Levy.

Viability and Affordable Housing

A key principle of planning is that proposals for residential development must be deliverable. This is encapsulated by Paragraph 173 of the NPPF, which states the following:

"Pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking. Plans should be deliverable. Therefore, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable development to be deliverable."

The PPG states that where the deliverability of the development may be compromised by the scale of planning obligations and other costs, a viability assessment may be necessary. This should be informed by the particular circumstances of the site and proposed development in question. A site is viable if the value generated by its development exceeds the costs of developing it and also provides sufficient incentive for the land to come forward and the development to be undertaken. Where an applicant is able to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that the planning obligation would cause the development to be unviable, the Local Planning Authority should be flexible in seeking planning obligations.

In this instance the applicant has submitted a viability appraisal which has been assessed by the Council's own viability consultant. Whilst the applicant/developer could account for and meet those costs associated with the planning obligations outlined above, there has been difficulty in providing a balance that would both secure a reasonable level of profit against the Council's requirement for a 35% affordable housing provision.

Following a significant level of discussion, it has been demonstrated to the satisfaction of your officers that the scheme cannot be viewed as being viable and deliverable where a requirement for 35% is rigidly held, given the high costs associated with both meeting key requirements for infrastructure and the need to service the site in order for it to be developed.

The submitted scheme for up to 280 no. homes and the provision of a 60 no. bed care home, with a delivery of 20% affordable housing, including the contributions as set out above, does however offer an acceptable return to the landowners and projects a reasonable profit for the development. In order to meet this, the mix and precise tenure of those affordable units has been considered carefully, where a greater provision of 'starter homes' has been allowed for.

Starter homes fall under the definition of Intermediate Affordable Housing in Annex 2 of the NPPF and are likely to become more prevalent and desirable in the future, given the recent royal assent of the Housing and Planning Bill.

The proposal does then represent a reduction in the level of affordable housing from that required by the development plan. However, the NPPF is clear at paragraph 173 that development should not be subject to such obligations and

policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened; developer profit is therefore a key element of a scheme's viability. Furthermore, at paragraph 176 the NPPF goes on to state that "where safeguards are necessary to make a particular development acceptable in planning terms, the development should not be approved if the measures required cannot be secured through appropriate conditions or agreements". In the light of this it is considered that the infrastructure requirements are necessary for the development, and although contrary to policy the reduction in affordable housing is necessary to ensure that this development is both viable and capable of delivery.

It is therefore considered that the proposal, with a reduced level of affordable housing, should not be considered as unacceptable in this respect.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

At the heart of the balancing exercise to be undertaken by decision makers is Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004; which requires that, if regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the Planning Acts, determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The development would have a number of significant benefits, including the delivery of a major quantum of housing in a sustainable location at a viable mix of both open market and affordable units. When taken as a whole, and as a matter of planning judgment, the proposal is considered to adhere to the development plan (where those applicable policies are considered to be consistent with the NPPF), other material planning considerations including the NPPF, and imposed statutory duties and responsibilities. The proposal is consequently considered to represent a sustainable form of development, where there exists a presumption in favour of such development in accordance with paragraph 14 of the NPPF and Policy FC1 of the Core Strategy Focused Review.

This presumption in favour of sustainable development is further reinforced by advice relating to decision-taking in the NPPF. Paragraph 186 of the Framework requires Local Planning Authorities to "*approach decision taking in a positive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development*". Paragraph 187 states that Local Planning Authorities "*should look for solutions rather than problems, and decision takers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible*".

In the absence of any justifiable or demonstrable material consideration indicating otherwise, it is considered that the proposals are therefore acceptable in planning terms and a positive recommendation to Members is given below.

RECOMMENDATION

- (1) That the Planning Lead - Growth and Sustainable Planning be authorised to secure a planning obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990, to provide:-
 - Provision and management of public open space/play equipment;

- Affordable Housing as agreed (20%);
- That subsequent planning applications for the development of the site should be substantially in accordance with the provisions of the development brief;
- Travel Plan details and provision, as agreed with SCC;
- Education - £1,768,253
- Pre-school provision - £170,548
- Libraries - £60,480
- NHS England - £100,380
- Highway Safety Improvements (Town Centre, Primary and High Schools) - £75,000;
- Public transport - £37,000;
- Rights of way - £46,150;
- Sports facilities/pitch drainage in Eye - £100,000.

(2) That, subject to the completion of the Planning Obligation in Resolution (1) above, the Planning Lead - Growth and Sustainable Planning be authorised to grant Planning Permission subject to conditions including:-

General

- Time limit for reserved matters (standard)
- Definition of reserved matters
- Approved plans; red-lined SLP and masterplan (only in so far as relating to access)
- Quantum of residential development fixed to a maximum of 280 no. dwellings
- Maximum height of care home to be two storeys
- Development to be completed in accordance with ecology details
- Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods shall not be permitted, unless otherwise agreed

Prior to commencement/installation (where relevant)

- External lighting/illumination details
- Archaeology WSI/Assessment
- Waste management/recycling details
- Foul and surface water drainage details
- Arboricultural method statement/tree protection details
- Landscape management plan
- Fire hydrant provision details
- Construction management plan
- Land contamination strategy, investigation and remediation (if necessary)
- Land contamination monitoring and maintenance plan
- Provision of alternative habitat for Skylarks

Concurrently with Reserved Matters

- Phasing details (inc. trigger points for each successive phase)
- Proposed levels and finished floor levels details
- External facing materials details
- Energy efficiency/BREEAM details
- Hard landscaping scheme (inc. boundary treatments and screen/fencing details)
- Soft landscaping scheme

- Emergency access treatment/management details
- Refuse bin details

Highways

- Parking, manoeuvring, and cycle storage details
 - Parking to be in accordance with adopted standards
 - Roundabout access details
 - School drop-off and zebra crossing details
 - Surface water discharge prevention details
 - Estate roads and footpaths details and implementation requirements
 - HGV/deliveries management plan
- (3) That, in the event of the Planning Obligation referred to in Resolution (1) above not being secured the Planning Lead - Growth and Sustainable Planning be authorised to refuse Planning Permission, for reason(s) including:-
- Inadequate provision of infrastructure contributions which would fail to provide compensatory benefits to the sustainability of the development and its wider impacts, contrary to the development plan and national planning policy.

Philip Isbell
Professional Lead - Growth & Sustainable Planning

Steven Stroud
Senior Planning Officer

APPENDIX A - PLANNING POLICIES

1. Mid Suffolk Core Strategy Development Plan Document and the Core Strategy Focused Review

- Cor1** - CS1 Settlement Hierarchy
- Cor2** - CS2 Development in the Countryside & Countryside Villages
- Cor5** - CS5 Mid Suffolks Environment
- Cor3** - CS3 Reduce Contributions to Climate Change
- Cor4** - CS4 Adapting to Climate Change
- Cor6** - CS6 Services and Infrastructure
- Cor7** - CS7 Brown Field Target
- Cor8** - CS8 Provision and Distribution of Housing
- Cor9** - CS9 Density and Mix
- CSFR-FC1** - PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
- CSFR-FC1.1** - MID SUFFOLK APPROACH TO DELIVERING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
- CSFR-FC2** - PROVISION AND DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING

2. Mid Suffolk Local Plan

- CL6** - TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS
- CL8** - PROTECTING WILDLIFE HABITATS
- H17** - KEEPING RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AWAY FROM POLLUTION

- GP1 - DESIGN AND LAYOUT OF DEVELOPMENT
- RT12 - FOOTPATHS AND BRIDLEWAYS
- HB13 - PROTECTING ANCIENT MONUMENTS
- H2 - HOUSING DEVELOPMENT IN TOWNS
- T9 - PARKING STANDARDS
- T10 - HIGHWAY CONSIDERATIONS IN DEVELOPMENT
- H4 - PROPORTION OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN NEW HOUSING DEVELOPMENT
- H15 - DEVELOPMENT TO REFLECT LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS
- H14 - A RANGE OF HOUSE TYPES TO MEET DIFFERENT ACCOMMODATION NEEDS
- H17 - KEEPING RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AWAY FROM POLLUTION
- H13 - DESIGN AND LAYOUT OF HOUSING DEVELOPMENT
- E9 - LOCATION OF NEW BUSINESSES

3. **Planning Policy Statements, Circulars & Other policy**

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework

APPENDIX B - NEIGHBOUR REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of representations have been received from a total of 37 interested parties.

The following people **objected** to the application

[Redacted list of names]

[Redacted]

The following people **supported** the application:

The following people **commented** on the application:

) [Redacted]