

Committee Report

Item 7D

Reference: DC/20/04921

Case Officer: Alex Scott

Ward: Mendlesham.

Ward Member/s: Cllr Andrew Stringer.

RECOMMENDATION – GRANT OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION WITH CONDITIONS

Description of Development

Outline Planning Application (access, layout and scale to be considered) - Residential Development of 14no dwellings (including 4no affordable dwellings) garaging, construction of access and associated parking.

Location

Land East Of, Hockey Hill, Wetheringsett Cum Brockford, Suffolk

Expiry Date: 18/08/2021

Application Type: OUT - Outline Planning Application

Development Type: Major Small Scale - Dwellings

Applicant: D I Alston Will Trust Ltd

Agent:

Parish: Wetheringsett Cum Brockford

Site Area: 0.9 hectares

Density of Development:

Gross Density (Total Site): 15.56 dwellings per hectare (dph)

Net Density (Developed Site, excluding open space and SuDs): 18.67 dph

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

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

Has the application been subject to Pre-Application Advice: Yes - Ref: DC/19/00779 - 12/03/2019 - Planning Officers considered proposal acceptable in principle.

PART ONE – REASON FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE

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

Mid Suffolk District Council is the landowner of part of the site.

PART TWO – POLICIES AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Summary of Policies

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework
FC01 - Presumption In Favour Of Sustainable Development
FC01_1 - Mid Suffolk Approach To Delivering Sustainable Development
FC02 - Provision And Distribution Of Housing
CS01 - Settlement Hierarchy
CS03 - Reduce Contributions to Climate Change
CS04 - Adapting to Climate Change
CS05 - Mid Suffolk's Environment
CS09 - Density and Mix
GP01 - Design and layout of development
HB01 - Protection of historic buildings
HB08 - Conservation Areas
HB14 - Ensuring archaeological remains are not destroyed
CL08 - Protecting wildlife habitats
CL11 - Retaining high quality agricultural land
H04- Proportion of Affordable Housing
H13 - Design and layout of housing development
H15 - Development to reflect local characteristics
H16 - Protecting existing residential amenity
H17 - Keeping residential development away from pollution
T09 - Parking Standards
T10 - Highway Considerations in Development

Neighbourhood Plan Status

This application site is / is not within a Neighbourhood Plan Area.

The Neighbourhood Plan is currently at:-

Stage 1: Designated neighbourhood area - Wetheringsett Cum Brockford Parish

Accordingly, the Neighbourhood Plan has little weight.

Consultations and Representations

During the course of the application Consultation and Representations from third parties have been received. These are summarised below.

A: Summary of Consultations

Town/Parish Council (Appendix 3)

Wetheringsett Cum Brockford Parish Council - 08/12/2020, 08/06/2021 & 03/08/2021:

Recommends Refusal:

- MSDC has a 5 year housing land supply;
- The site is not allocated in the draft JLP;
- Majority of services would need to be accessed by Car;
- Parish wish to see development focused at Brockford Street, with access to public transport and convenience shop;
- The proposal would impact a listed dwelling;
- Object to proposed removal of Garages at Hockey Hill cul-de-sac;
- Current infrastructure would be unable to cope with additional surface water runoff, which will result in flooding;
- The site has historically been amenity land, used by the community and provides wildlife habitats;
- The resultant vehicle movements would result in congestion and disruption for existing residents - access to main A140 is via narrow roads with sharp bends - Concern with regards highway safety;
- The proposal would considerably impact the amenities of neighbouring properties;
- Concerns with regards highway and pedestrian safety due to continued use of agricultural track, which would cross to proposed access road.

National Consultee (Appendix 4)

Natural England - 13/11/2020, 21/05/2021 & 30/07/2021:

Natural England has no comments to make on this application.

Anglian Water - 26/11/2020, 17/05/2021 & 29/07/2021:

Foul drainage is in the catchment of Mendlesham Water Recycling Centre, that will have available capacity for these flows.

County Council Responses (Appendix 5)

SCC - Highways - 24/11/2020, 20/05/2021 & 29/07/2021:

Do not object to the proposal: The proposal can achieve the required visibility spays for the access; The proposal will generate 11 vehicle trips within the peak hour period; The site is a 5 minute walk to the

Primary School along a continuous footway; No significant highway safety concerns; Sufficient parking has been provided for the existing parking area and for the size of the development - This development can provide safe and suitable access to the site for all users and would not have a severe impact on the road network – Standard Access; Visibility Splay; Vehicle Parking; Cycle Parking; Electric Vehicle Charging; Bin Storage and Presentation; and construction management conditions required.

SCC - Lead Local Flood Authority - 10/11/2020, 18/05/2021 & 02/06/2021:

Holding Objection at this time: Revised strategy for disposal of surface water required - Advice given with regards requirements.

SCC - Lead Local Flood Authority - 22/06/2021:

Recommend approval subject to conditions (above holding objection removed on basis of additional information received).

SCC - Archaeology - 01/12/2020, 25/05/2021 & 22/07/2021:

No grounds to consider refusal of permission in order to achieve preservation in situ of important heritage assets - Programme of archaeological work required prior to commencement.

SCC - Fire and Rescue - 11/11/2020, 17/05/2021 & 03/08/2021:

Recommend Fire Hydrants be installed within this development on a suitable route for laying hose - Sprinklers also advised.

SCC - Development Contributions - 12/11/2020 & 18/05/2021:

Education, Libraries Improvements and Waste contributions to be covered by CIL - S106 required for Secondary School Transport contributions.

Internal Consultee Responses (Appendix 6)

MSDC - Heritage Team - 27/11/2020, 28/05/2021 & 23/07/2021:

No material impact on Wetheringsett Conservation Area - Very low impact on significance of nearest Listed Building.

MSDC - Ecology Consultants (Place Services) - 24/11/2020 & 18/05/2021:

Holding Objection due to insufficient ecological information - Further survey information requested.

MSDC - Ecology Consultants (Place Services) - 04/08/2020:

No objection subject to ecological mitigation measures and enhancement measures.
(above holding objection removed on basis of additional information received).

MSDC - Environmental Protection - Land Contamination Issues -

Comments pending at time of writing - Update to be provided prior to Committee meeting.

MSDC - Environmental Protection - Air Quality - 13/11/2020, 27/05/2021 & 30/07/2021:

No Objection - A development of this scale is highly unlikely to cause significant adverse impact on local air quality measured against standing guidance.

MSDC - Environmental Protection - Sustainability - 26/11/2020, 02/06/2021 & 30/07/2021:

No Objection - Subject to a condition ensuring implementation water, energy and resource efficiency measures.

MSDC - Environmental Protection - Other Issues - 16/12/2020, 18/05/2021 & 02/08/2021:

No objection - Construction hours condition required.

MSDC - Arboricultural Officer - 08/12/2020:

No Objection - Tree proposed to be removed is of limited amenity value and not of sufficient importance - Subject to works being carried out in accordance with submitted arboricultural report - Condition advised.

MSDC - Public Realm - 10/11/2020, 17/05/2021 & 03/08/2021:

Support the inclusion of the pond within this new development but have no further comments to offer.

MSDC - Strategic Housing - 19/11/2020, 26/05/2021 & 01/06/2021:

35% Affordable Housing Required as proposal is for over 10 dwellings, to be secured by way of s106 - Required mix for affordable housing, and s106 requirements, provided – Concerns with regards parking layout provided with respect of affordable dwellings.

MSDC - Waste Management - 27/11/2020:

No objection - Subject to conditions.

MSDC - Communities - Consulted: 06/11/2020, 14/05/2021 and 21/07/2021 - No response received.

MSDC – Contract and Asset Management - Consulted 06/11/2020, 14/05/2021 and 21/07/2021 - No response received.

Mid Suffolk Disability Forum - 14/11/2020 & 24/07/2021:

All dwellings should meet Part M4 of Building Regulations - Pleased to note that 6 bungalows are included in this development - A disabled visitor parking space should be included in the development - Footpaths should be 1500mm wide, with dropped kerbs level with the road - Surfaces should be firm, durable and level.

B: Representations

At the time of writing this report at least 20 letters/emails/online comments have been received. It is the officer opinion that this represents 19 objections, 1 support and 0 general comment. A verbal update shall be provided as necessary.

Views are summarised below:-

Comments raising concern or objection with regards the application proposal are summarised below:

- The proposal is not allocated for housing in the existing or emerging Local Plans;

- Mid Suffolk has their five year housing land supply - so there is no need for more housing at present;
- The emerging Joint Local Plan allows only minor development in the village - this is a major development proposal;
- Increase in traffic on the main road through the village and an increase in traffic in general;
- Proposal would result in increased traffic and increased risk to pedestrian safety as parts of the road do not have footpaths;
- The resultant vehicle movements would result in congestion and disruption for existing residents;
- Existing access to main A140 is via narrow roads with sharp bends - Concern with regards highway safety due to increased traffic on these roads;
- The proposal would result in less parking on the Hockey Hill cul de sac and less garage space available;
- The proposal would result in the loss of garages - question whether demand for local garages and waiting list have been investigated;
- Cars already park on the road obstructing the proposed access - Question how emergency service vehicles will access development;
- Concerns with regards highway and pedestrian safety due to continued use of agricultural track, which would cross to proposed access road;
- The proposal would impact the quiet nature of the village;
- The proposal will increase the likelihood of more developments in the village;
- The village has few existing services to support the proposed development and the proposal would put reliance on the car as a mode of transport, resulting in further increased traffic movements and pollution;
- Local services are inadequate to support development - local doctors considered to be oversubscribed;
- The proposal site was used as a football pitch in the 1980's - Consider the proposal would result in the loss of village amenity space;
- Understand the site and field in question are listed as a playing field, used for sports in the past and frequented by dog walkers and has been the site of social gatherings - the proposal would, therefore, result in loss of public open space, which is unacceptable;
- The proposal would impact wildlife, protected species and habitats;
- Concern with regards additional Trees being planted and the impact this will have on neighbouring amenity with regards loss of daylight and leaf litter;
- Concern with regards increased flood risk;
- Balancing pond noted and question whether this would have an outflow - concern with regards flooding of neighbouring gardens;
- The addition of a pond creates an additional safety risk for children;
- The proposal would be Major Development and is out of character an proportion with this small village;
- The proposal is not infill development;
- The design of the dwellings is too varied and would destroy, or have a negative impact on the character of the village;
- The proposal is backland/estate development which is not consistent with the existing character of the village;
- Concern with regards increased overlooking and loss of privacy for neighbouring properties;
- The applicant claims the development would result in employment opportunities - question how and for whom - the development is purely a residential scheme;
- The properties will not be affordable for local people, save for the affordable housing;
- The proposal is purely a profit making venture by developers and the land owner;
- A general dislike of the proposed development, the developers and development in general.

Comments in support of the application proposal are summarised below:

- Existing garages are hardly used for parking;
- The proposal gives more parking;
- Balancing Pond should create an amenity area;
- 4 no affordable homes are proposed - which is what is needed;
- Market housing will be 2-3 bedroom houses - which is what is needed, not 4-5 beds;
- Rural communities have to grow or die;
- The parish has plenty of amenities and facilities and a School - these need supporting by this expansion of small residences.

(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

No relevant Planning History.

PART THREE – ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION

1. The Site and Surroundings

- 1.1. The site is located to the east of Hockey Hill, Wetheringsett, set behind existing dwellings fronting the highway in this location, and to the south of an existing estate of dwellings at Hockey Hill cul-de-sac.
- 1.2. The site comprises predominately a grass field, measuring 0.97 hectares, set between existing dwellings fronting Hockey Hill to the west and open countryside to the east, with gardens of further residential properties to the north and south. Representations received have indicated that the site has previously been used as public open space and a sports pitch in the past, however the area does not appear to be in such designated use at present and it is not allocated for as such in any current or emerging development plan document. This area of the site is shown to be presently Grade 3, moderate quality agricultural/grazing land, according to the Council's GIS mapping system.
- 1.3. The site also includes an area comprising 12 no. existing garages and associated hardstanding, fronting the Hockey Hill cul-de-sac, measuring 0.0655 hectares.
- 1.4. The two areas of the site are separated by an existing agricultural track and access, which runs from west to east through the site. The red line site plan does include an access point, across this agricultural access, linking the two areas of the site.
- 1.5. The site lies within the settlement boundary of Wetheringsett, as designated in the current development plan, and the site has previously been allocated for housing development in the 1998 MSDC Local Plan.

- 1.6. The site also affects the setting of 2 no. grade II listed buildings, at Paxes House and Hill Farm House, which lie in close proximity to the south-west of the site, fronting the main Hockey Hill Highway.

2. The Proposal

- 2.1. The application seeks outline planning permission, with matters relation to access, layout and scale to be considered, for the erection of 14 no. new dwellings, including 4 no. affordable dwellings, garages and parking areas and construction of a new estate road access to the Hockey Hill cul-de-sac, following demolition of the existing garage buildings.
- 2.2. Matters relating to landscaping and the appearance of buildings are presently reserved, to be considered as part of a follow on reserved matters application, should the current application be approved.
- 2.3. A large surface water attenuation basin is also proposed to the centre-north of the site, which it is considered will both serve as a Sustainable Surface Water Drainage (SuDs) and an amenity feature.
- 2.4. The proposed net density of housing development would be 18.67 dwellings per hectare (dph), with back to back distances of no less than 22 metres.
- 2.5. The proposed dwelling types are broken down as follows:

Market Dwellings

Two Bedroom semi-detached - Bungalow	= 2 no.
Two Bedroom detached – Bungalow	= 4 no.
Three Bedroom detached - Two-storey	= 4 no.
TOTAL	= 10 no.

Affordable Dwellings

Two Bedroom semi-detached - Bungalow	= 2 no.
Two Bedroom semi-detached - Two-storey	= 2 no.
TOTAL	= 4 no.

- 2.6. Details relating to the dwelling's design and external facing materials is presently reserved, however details relating to their siting and footprints is given on the proposed layout drawing.

3. The Principle of Development

- 3.1. The proposal site lies within the settlement boundary of the village, as designated in the existing development plan.
- 3.2. Development Plan policy CS1 lists Wetheringsett as a secondary village, which includes provision for meeting local housing needs, within designated settlement boundaries, in particular affordable housing.
- 3.3. The proposed development is, therefore, considered acceptable in principle, in accordance with development plan policy CS1, subject to other material planning considerations.

4. Design and Layout [Impact on Street Scene]

- 4.1. The layout provided is considered to propose a development of an acceptable density and housing mix for such a rural character village as Wetheringsett. The proposal provides a spacious layout, with a proportion of open space.
- 4.2. Details relating to the appearance and design of the proposed dwellings, and hard landscape features, are presently reserved.
- 4.3. The proposed layout does indicate soft landscape and tree planting to site boundaries and soft landscaped features within the development, which is supported in principle. Matters relating to landscaping are, however, presently reserved.

5. Heritage Issues [Including impact on character and appearance of Conservation Areas and on setting and significance of Listed Buildings]

- 5.1. The proposal site lies approximately 250 metres to the south of Wetheringsett Conservation Area. Your Heritage officers have assessed the application proposal and do not consider it would result in a material impact on its setting and significance.
- 5.2. To the south west of the site stand two Grade II Listed Buildings at Paxes House and Hill Farm House. Your heritage officers advise that whilst the proposal would increase residential development within the setting of these assets, and to the rear of Paxes House in particular, changing part of their setting, open countryside would remain the immediate rear and south east of these assets. Your Heritage Officers, therefore, advise that the impact on the setting of the listed buildings would be low and the harm to their significance would be very low.
- 5.3. It is therefore concluded that, in the opinion of your officers, the proposed development would result in a very low level of less than substantial harm to the significance of heritage assets.
- 5.4. NPPF paragraph 199 states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. NPPF paragraph 202 provides further that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
- 5.5. In your officers' opinion the public benefits associated with the proposal: contributing to the stock of affordable dwellings in the locality and housing supply more generally; in a sustainable location; supporting the existing community and existing local services and facilities, significantly outweigh the very low level of harm identified to the heritage assets.
- 5.6. As such the proposed development is considered to be in accordance with the provisions of development plan policies HB1 and HB8, having had regard to the provisions of the NPPF (in particular section 16) as a material planning consideration.

6. Archaeology

- 6.1. This site lies in an area of archaeological potential recorded on the County Historic Environment Record (HER). Located close to finds scatters dating from the Iron Age (HER ref no. WCB 010), Roman (WCB 028 & WCB 062), Saxon (WCB 034 & WCB 062) and medieval (WCB 008, WCB 010 & WCB 061) periods. Additionally, the site is close to the location of a series of undated cropmarks, which show a possible track or road, along with fields and small enclosures (WCB 006). As a result, there is high potential for the discovery of below-ground heritage assets of archaeological importance within this area, and groundworks associated with the development have the potential to damage or destroy any archaeological remains which exist.
- 6.2. SCC Archaeology have been consulted on the application proposal and advise that there are no grounds to consider refusal of permission in order to achieve preservation in situ of any important heritage assets. However, in accordance with NPPF paragraph 205 SCC Archaeology advise that any permission granted should be the subject of a planning condition to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage asset before it is damaged or destroyed.

7. Site Access, Parking and Highway Safety Considerations

- 7.1. The proposed means of access to the site would be via a proposed estate road access, onto the Hockey Hill cul-de-sac, crossing the existing agricultural track in order to access the southern, field, portion of the site.
- 7.2. The proposed access solution would include the demolition of the existing garages on the Hockey Hill cul-de-sac estate and their replacement with 8 no. hardstanding parking spaces, 3 no. of which would be allocated for disabled parking, adjacent to the proposal estate access road.
- 7.3. The applicant has stated that the existing field access from Hockey Hill, to the west, will remain in the applicant's ownership and will continue to allow access for farm vehicles to the agricultural land to the east of the site, crossing part of the proposed access road in order to do so.
- 7.4. SCC Highways were approached by the applicant prior to the application being submitted and confirmed their agreement to the principle of the proposed access arrangements to the site, including the proposed parking provision for the existing dwellings on the Hockey Hill Estate.
- 7.5. SCC Highways have been formally considered on the current planning application and have confirmed they have no objection to the proposal
- 7.6. SCC Highways consider the proposal can achieve the required visibility splays for the proposed access.
- 7.7. SCC Highways advise that the proposal would generate 11 no. additional vehicle trips within the peak hour period, which is considered to be within acceptable tolerances.
- 7.8. SCC Highways advise that the site is a 5 minute walk to the Local Primary School along a continuous footway and there are no significant highway or pedestrian safety concerns in this respect.

- 7.9. SCC Highways advise that sufficient parking has been proposed throughout the proposed development, sufficient to serve both existing and proposed properties, in accordance with existing parking standards.
- 7.10. SCC Highway Engineers and your Officer conclude that the proposed development would provide safe and suitable access to the site for all users and would not have a severe impact on the existing road network, subject to recommended conditions being applied to any permission granted.
- 7.11. As such the proposed development is considered to be in accordance with the provisions of development plan policies T9 and T9, having had regard to the provisions of the NPPF (in particular paragraphs 110, 111 and 112) as a material planning consideration.

8. Impact on Residential Amenity

- 8.1. 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.
- 8.2. Paragraph 130 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.
- 8.3. The proposed layout provided is considered to sufficiently demonstrate that the site is readily capable of accommodating the proposed number and density of dwellings in a manner that will not unduly compromise the residential amenity of future occupiers of the development or occupiers of neighbouring dwellings. The proposed dwellings give no rise to unacceptable amenity impacts, owing largely to the separation distances between proposed dwellings and existing neighbouring dwellings and the orientation of buildings proposed.
- 8.4. Further consideration with regards potential loss of privacy and overlooking will need to be given following submission of reserved matters, when fenestration layouts are proposed.
- 8.5. Your officers therefore consider and advise that the current proposal generally accords with the aspirations of development plan policies H13 and H16 and with paragraph 130 of the NPPF in this regard, subject to agreed detail.

9. Ecology, Biodiversity and Protected Species

- 9.1. The Council's Ecological consultants have been consulted on the application proposal and have reviewed the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Anglian Ecology, March 2019), the eDNA Survey (Anglian Ecology, April 2021), provided by the applicant, relating to the likely impacts of development on designated sites, protected & Priority species and habitats. They also confirm they have reviewed the further response from applicant's ecologist (Anglian Ecology, July 2021), as well as the amended site plan – Rev D (Thurlow Architects, October 2020).
- 9.2. The Council's consultant Ecologists are satisfied that there is sufficient ecological information available for determination, as no trees or hedgerows will be effected from the proposed works.

Your consultants advise that this provides certainty for the LPA of the likely impacts on designated sites, protected and Priority Species/ Habitats and, with appropriate mitigation measures secured, the development can be made acceptable.

- 9.3. Your consultants advise that the mitigation measures identified in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Anglian Ecology, March 2019), the eDNA Survey (Anglian Ecology, April 2021) should be secured and implemented in full. Members are advised that this is necessary to conserve protected and Priority Species.
- 9.4. In addition, your consultants support the proposed reasonable biodiversity enhancements, which have been recommended to secure measurable net gains for biodiversity, as outlined at Paragraph 174 [d] of the NPPF (2021). Members are advised that the reasonable biodiversity enhancement measures should be outlined within a Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy and should be secured as a condition of any consent. Your consultants advise that this will enable LPA to demonstrate its compliance with its statutory duties including its biodiversity duty under s40 NERC Act 2006.
- 9.5. Your consultants advise that impacts relating to the proposed development will be minimised such that the proposal is acceptable subject to the conditions below based on BS42020:2013.
- 9.10. Your Ecological consultants recommend that any permission granted is subject to conditions securing the ecological appraisal recommendations, as set out by the applicant's consultants, and also requiring further Biodiversity enhancements, as recommended. Your officers agree with this recommendation.

10. Flood Risk and Surface Water Drainage

- 10.1. The applicant has produced a detailed Flood Risk Assessment / Surface Water Drainage Strategy, carried out by a suitably qualified company, submitted with the application, and amended subsequently, following advice given by the Lead Local Flood Authority at Suffolk County Council.
- 10.2. The report is considered to satisfactorily demonstrate that the proposed development is at 'low' risk of flooding from all sources.
- 10.3. SCC-Local Lead Flood Authority (LLFA) have been consulted on the application proposal and, following negotiation and receipt of revised and further information from the applicant, resolved to recommend approval of this application on basis of the most recent proposals submitted, subject to further information to be secured by way of conditions.
- 10.4. In assessing the proposal, subject to agreed detail, your officers consider the surface water drainage scheme, as currently proposed would, in principle, suitably manage surface water runoff from the proposed development and would not demonstrably result in significant increased flood risk on the site or elsewhere.

11. Land Contamination

- 11.1. The applicant has provided a phase 1 desk study and preliminary risk assessment report as part of the application, carried out by a suitably qualified company. Which concludes that the potential overall risk to Human Health and Controlled Waters arising from contaminative sources at the site

is considered to be very low risk. The report states that no significant sources of potential contamination have been identified and advises that further intrusive phase 2 investigation is not required.

- 11.2. The site is not, therefore, considered to pose a significant risk to future occupants from sources of land contamination.
- 11.3. As with all development proposals of this nature: the developer is advised to contact the Council should any unexpected ground conditions be encountered during construction. The developer is also advised that responsibility for safe development of the site ultimately lies with them.

12. Planning Obligations / CIL

- 12.1. SCC have advised that Education, Libraries Improvements and Waste contributions associated with the proposed development will be covered by CIL and that a Section 106 agreement is required in order to secure Secondary School Transport contributions.
- 12.2. The application includes the provision of 4 no. affordable homes. There will also be required to be secured by way of S106.

13. Parish Council Comments

- 13.1. The majority of matters raised by Wetheringsett Cum Brockford Parish Council have been considered in the above report, but the following issues have also been raised:
 - MSDC has a 5 year housing land supply (question of housing need);
 - Parish wish to see development focused at Brockford Street, with access to public transport and convenience shop;
 - Object to proposed removal of Garages at Hockey Hill cul-de-sac.
- 13.2. It is acknowledged that the Council is able to currently a 5 year supply of land for housing developments. This does not, however, preclude further housing developments coming forward, such as this current proposal, which are in accordance with the provisions of the current development plan.
- 13.3. The Parish Council's aspirations with regards planning for future developments in the Parish are noted and appreciated, however, this does not preclude development proposals such as this, which are in accordance with the provisions of the current development plan.
- 13.4. The Parish Council's objection to the removal of the existing garages is noted, however, it is understood that the current proposal would ultimately benefit parking provision on the existing cul-de-sac.

PART FOUR – CONCLUSION

14. Planning Balance and Conclusion

- 14.1. The principle of development is considered acceptable, in accordance with the provisions of current development plan policy CS1, being located with the existing settlement boundary of a Secondary Village, and providing affordable housing.
- 14.2. The proposed layout is considered acceptable in terms of the existing character and density of housing development in the village and is not considered to result in significant harm to existing residential amenity, subject to further detail to be secured by way of conditions.
- 14.3. Whilst the proposal is considered to result in a small amount of harm to the significance of a heritage asset, the public benefits of the proposal are considered to outweigh this harm, consistent with the requirements of the NPPF.
- 14.4. The proposed access, road layout, and parking and manoeuvring provision within the development site have been assessed by the Local Highway Authority and are considered acceptable in terms of highway safety, as is the proposal's impact on the existing highway network.
- 14.5. The proposal is also considered acceptable with regards issues relating to: Surface Water Drainage; Contaminated Land Assessment; Ecology; and Archaeology, subject additional detail to be secured by way of condition.

RECOMMENDATION

That the application is GRANTED outline planning permission:

(1) Subject to the prior agreement of a Section 106 Planning Obligation on appropriate terms to the satisfaction of the Chief Planning Officer as summarised below and those as may be deemed necessary by the Chief Planning Officer to secure:

- Affordable housing of an appropriate number mix and tenure, as advised by Council Officers;
- Secondary School Transportation costs, as advised by SCC.

(2) That the Chief Planning Officer be authorised to GRANT Outline Planning Permission upon completion of the legal agreement subject to conditions as summarised below and those as may be deemed necessary by the Chief Planning Officer:

- Standard outline planning permission time limit (Submission of reserved matters within 3 years and commencement of development no later than 2 years following approval of reserved matters);
- Standard reserved matters condition (no development to commence prior to approval of reserved matters (Appearance and Landscaping in this case));
- Standard approved plans and documents condition (Development to be carried out in accordance with approved plans and documents as listed);
- Landscaping timescales for implementation and aftercare;
- Those required by the Local Highway Authority;
- Those required by the Lead Local Flood Authority;
- Those required by SCC Archaeology;
- Those required by MSDC Arboricultural Officer;
- Those required by MSDC Waste Services;
- Those required by the Council's Ecological consultants;
- Sustainability and energy efficiency measures to be agreed;
- Fire Hydrants Condition;
- Agreed hours of work during construction;
- Existing agricultural field access to be retained and to remain unobstructed.

(3) And the following informative notes as summarised and those as may be deemed necessary:

- Pro active working statement
- SCC Highways notes
- Support for sustainable development principles
- Contaminated Land note
- Protected Species note
- S106 note.

(4) That in the event of the Planning obligations or requirements referred to in Resolution (1) above not being secured and/or not secured within 6 months that the Chief Planning Officer be authorised to refuse the application on appropriate ground.