

## **Committee Report**

**Item No: 6C**

**Reference:** DC/21/02296

**Case Officer:** Samantha Summers

**Ward:** Lavenham.

**Ward Member/s:** Cllr Clive Arthey. Cllr Margaret Maybury.

---

## **RECOMMENDATION – TO GRANT RESERVED MATTERS WITH CONDITIONS**

---

### **Description of Development**

Submission of details (Reserved Matters) under Outline Planning Permission DC/19/04755 dated 22/02/2021. Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for Erection of up to 28no. dwellings (Plots 5, 6 and 7 of Reserved Matters Permission DC/19/02020 to be repositioned/amended).

*NOTE – The applicant has also applied to discharge the following conditions: 8 (Estate Roads and Footpaths), 13 (Construction Environmental Management Plan), 14 (Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy), 15 (Landscape Environmental Management Plan), 19 (Surface Water Drainage Scheme), 29 (Electric Car Charging Points) and 30 (Tree Survey). Whilst these are not for debate here, they are mentioned where relevant.*

### **Location**

Land to the Rear of Plough and Fleece Inn, Great Green, Cockfield, Suffolk

**Expiry Date:** 23/08/2021

**Application Type:** RES - Reserved Matters

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

**Applicant:** The Sudbury Group Ltd.

**Agent:** DAP Architecture Ltd.

**Parish:** Cockfield

**Site Area:** 1.77Ha

**Density of Development:**

Gross Density (Total Site): 16 dwellings per Hectare

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

**Has a Committee Call In request been received from a Council Member:** No

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

---

---

## **PART ONE – REASON FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE**

---

The application is referred to committee for the following reason:

This is a major development of more than 15 dwellings.

---

## **PART TWO – POLICIES AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY**

---

### **Summary of Policies**

CN01 - Design Standards  
CN06 - Listed Buildings - Alteration/Ext/COU  
CR08 - Hedgerows  
TP15 - Parking Standards - New Development  
CS01 - Applying the presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development in Babergh  
CS02 - Settlement Pattern Policy  
CS03 - Strategy for Growth and Development  
CS11 - Core and Hinterland Villages  
CS15 - Implementing Sustainable Development  
CS18 - Mix and Types of Dwellings  
CS19 - Affordable Homes  
HS31 - Public Open Space (1.5 ha and above)  
NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework

### **Neighbourhood Plan Status**

This application site is not within a Neighbourhood Plan Area.

### **Consultations and Representations**

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

#### **A: Summary of Consultations**

##### **Cockfield Parish Council**

*“The Parish Council held an Ordinary Parish Council meeting on Thursday 24th June 2021 which included the item to determine a response to this reserved matters application.*

*The Councillors commented that reserved matters applications are usually points of compliance and detail between the applicant and BMSDC. However, in this case the Parish Council has an interest in continuing to ensure that the site has a satisfactory overall outcome.*

*The site is a significant development within the Village and under the original outline application DC/19/02020 the Parish Council provided extensive responses; 20th December 2019, 6<sup>th</sup> February 2020 and 2nd March 2020 to influence the overall layout, context, material choices and housing mix. Cockfield*

---

*Parish Council recognises that both the applicant and the BMSDC were able to manoeuvre the proposal such the granting of outline permission gave a more desirable outline result.*

*The Parish Council are now concerned that the overarching scheme that we endeavoured to secure is being undermined in the detailing and administration stage of this application.*

*A further detraction of the scheme was noted in that an application for a Non-Material Amendment had been made; DC/18/00306 and DC/19/02020 - Amendment to positions of Plots 05, 06 and 07 (as approved under Outline Application DC/19/04755). As shown on drawing no. DAPA\_1431\_250\_00, received on 27th May 2021: This change is not acceptable, as the combination of the above proposed amendments would result in a materially different development in terms of character and layout to what was previously considered and approved.*

*The Parish Council members welcomed this refusal and added that any dilution of the original approved principles would equally not be acceptable.*

*The Parish Council have not commented in regard to the more innocuous matters typically; items 5,8,11,12,13,14,15,26,27,28 and 30, such these subjects are concluded with the best compliant solutions be agreed between the applicant an BMSDC.*

*The Parish Council are unable to support particular matters;*

*10 - Parking; Members commented that parking provision must be no less than that required under the approved outline consent to give a compliant solution and not impact those on the development or adjacencies.*

*19 - Surface Water Drainage Scheme; One of the major concerns to the Parish Council is the central open space. This was one of the significant features in our support of the scheme. The open space as detailed on indicative plan 19025-2 Rev h brings the character and cohesion to the overall development and was noted as linking the development to the nearby Great Green. Site layout 200.04, 226, Public Open Space drawing 226.02 shows that the open space is now replaced with a surface water drainage attenuation basin. This is shown in more detail on Combined Topographic & Layout Drawings SU314-0002 D. Whilst the Parish Council appreciates that a surface water drainage strategy and implementation solution is required, this swale arrangement completely undermines our expectation and destroys the overall context of the development and amenity. This swale is not an insignificant depression, drawing SU314-213 shows varying invert levels giving an overall depth between 2.62 and 1.5 m i.e., IL 90.57 - 87.95 m and IL 89.95 - 87.95 m. The details capture both the 100 year and 30-year major rainfall event levels, although it is unclear what would be the normal water level within this pond. Importantly to what extent this then creates any safety issues with open water. No doubt the swale feature could bring some biodiversity merits, however this is in detriment to the wider amenity benefits the open space brought to the residents.*

*There are 7no surface water discharge points and one outfall working in conjunction with a crate attenuation tank at plot 11 forming a hybrid SuDS system. This in overall terms is reliant on the use of a third party drain on the northwest of the site which may not work in any event.*

*It must similarly be recognised that there are already surface water drainage issues at the site and the adjacent ongoing development. This has in fact already been highlighted in a Public comment from a near neighbour.*

*An overall solution needs to be found that also preserves the green open space as originally intended.*

*Impact on adjacent residents;*

Members were cognisant of the detailed response from a resident at 17 Dukes Meadow. The resident had clearly been in extensive dialogue with the applicant / developer in his accommodation of the foul drainage solution and that the buffer zone to the nearest properties was suitably provided. The Parish Council adds that BMSDC should ensure that he and other near neighbours should not be any more impacted than the approved principles and any attempts to relocate elements or change the scheme to their detriment should not be granted.

The Parish Council also notes comments and observations made by other statutory consultees in particular;

Heritage Team - Undated communication concerning; Character, impact and harm to the rural environment and urbanisation theme within the proposal, from which they are unable to support the scheme as presented. The Parish Council agrees that layout, materials choice, colour pallet and rural features are further adopted to de-urbanise the character and maintain a rural context.

Public Realm - Email 18th June and their comment concerning the omission of the public open space. The message is factually incorrect as it refers to communication with the Parish Council which has not occurred nor is it within our mandate to agree in any event. We suspect they were equally surprised to see the change of designation of this space.

Strategic Housing Email 24th June 2021 Management and administration being compliant with policy.

Archaeology Email 9th June Methodology document compliancy with policy.”

#### Bradfield St Clare

“Bradfield St Clare Parish Council have previously been in contact with Philip Isbell (Chief Planning Officer), Sara Mildmay-White (Borough Cllr for Bradfield St Clare Parish Council), Robert Lindsay (District and County Cllr for Cockfield Parish Council) and Karen Soons (County Cllr for Bradfield St Clare Parish Council), with regards to the impact that the planning and building of new homes in Cockfield is having on the volume of traffic travelling through Bradfield St Clare and in particular along Bury Road in the parish.

Bradfield St Clare PC along with County Cllr Karen Soons have worked hard and at significant cost to the parish to try to improve road safety. The Parish Council worked hard to secure a reduction in speed on some of its roads which were all 60 mph. Some but not all are now 40 mph, but there remains areas within the parish that are still 60 mph, and one in particular is at the junction of Bury Road and Bradfield St George Road, where all efforts the PC have been unable to secure a speed reduction.

The extensive building of new homes within the neighbouring parish of Cockfield, is now considered to be impacting upon the parish of Bradfield St Clare. The volume of vehicles travelling up through Bury Road in the parish of Bradfield St Clare, is felt to have increased and will do so even more so if this planning application is approved.

The Parish Council have made enquiries with County Cllr Robert Lindsay and County Cllr Karen Soons with regards to looking into using some of the CIL monies which will be received by Cockfield PC to improve road safety not only in their own parish but that in the parish of Bradfield St Clare as these developments mean that these new residents in Cockfield will undoubtedly be travelling through the hamlet of Bradfield St Clare and therefore volume of traffic is increasing. Whilst we understand and appreciate that it is not for either County Cllr to instruct Cockfield PC how to allocate their CIL monies, it does seem very unfair to the neighbouring parish that they have conducted work to try to improve road safety only for this in part to be undermined and diminished by the volume of traffic that is now travelling through that parish and will increase further with this application.

*We note that outline planning under application DC/19/04755 was given and it is dated 22/02/2021 and that this current application DC/21/02296 is for submission of detail in relation to that outline planning but would be respectfully request that Babergh Planning Department consider the impact of the neighbouring village of Bradfield St Clare and as the very least consider road safety in the parish. We have previously enquired whether Cockfield PC would assist in making the roads safer for both their own residents who are travelling through Bradfield St Clare and the residents of Bradfield St Clare by working alongside this PC to implement road safety measures such as reduction of speed limits on those roads which are still 60mph.*

*However, we now ask that Babergh District Council as a Local Planning Authority take into account the impact of the extensive number of new build homes within Cockfield and the lack of infrastructure both in that parish and the neighbouring parishes and how this is impacting on rural communities such as Bradfield St Clare.*

*Measures to assist in road safety and reduction of speed, particularly on Bury Road within Bradfield St Clare would be welcomed and not just for the residents of our own parish, but indeed all road users.”*

### **National Consultee**

#### Historic England

*On the basis of the information available to date, in our view you do not need to notify or consult us on this application under the relevant statutory provisions*

### **County Council Responses**

#### SCC – Archaeology

*There will be no requirement for conditions for archaeological investigation and recording on this reserved matters application, as there are archaeological conditions 5 and 6 secured by the outline application DC/19/04755.*

#### SCC – Fire and Rescue

*The Suffolk Fire & Rescue Service made comment on this site under the original planning application, DC/19/04755/OUT, in which we requested Fire Hydrant for this site.*

#### SCC – Infrastructure

*I have no comments to make on this application, but have copied to colleagues who deal with highways, public rights of way, floods planning and archaeological matters as they may have comments to make.*

#### SCC – Highway Authority

#### Layout

*Dimensions of the proposed roads and footways have not been supplied.*

- *For a site for 28 dwellings, the main road into the site should be Minor Road Access as shown in Suffolk Design Guide: carriageway width 5.5m and footway 2.0m (both sides), minimum centreline radius 15m, maximum gradient 1 in 15 or 1 in 25 for first 12m, minimum gradient 1 in 125, minimum forward visibility 30m*

- *Shared Surface roads; the road widths are 5.5m and reduced to 4.1m where no frontage development is present. 1m surfaced maintenance strips are required on both sides (enables the kerbing to be maintained and allow street lighting cables and columns to be within the highway boundary). If services are required in these strips, they are to be increased to 2m wide. Lengths of maintenance strips that are 10m or less are to be surfaced/blocked paved. Longer service strips can be grassed verges. Granite ramps are required to the approaches of each shared surface road with footways extended 2m beyond for safe pedestrian access (see page 103 in Suffolk Design Guide) has been shown on the plans provided. the road widths are 5.5m and reduced to 4.1m where no frontage development is present.*
- *a drawing showing the forward visibility of the bends and junctions is required to ensure the layout meets Manual for Streets guidance*
- *All footway links within the site are to have bound surfacing to enable use throughout the year.*
- *Full details finishes and construction will be agreed under s38 of Highways Act 1980 if the developer wishes the roads and footways to be adopted by SCC as the Highway Authority.*

### **REVISED COMMENTS OF SCC- HIGHWAYS DATED 11THE OCTOBER 2021**

*Notice is hereby given that the County Council as Highway Authority make the following comments:*

- *Dimensions of the proposed roads and footways are to Suffolk Design Guide. The details are to be to Suffolk County Estate Road Specification.*
- *the drawing showing the forward visibility to Manual for Streets standards has been provided*
- *Full details finishes and construction will be agreed under s38 of Highways Act 1980 if the developer wishes the roads and footways to be adopted by SCC as the Highway Authority.*
- *dwellings without garages have sheds suitable for cycle storage and parking*

### **CONDITIONS**

*Should the Planning Authority be minded to grant planning approval the Highway Authority in Suffolk would recommend they include the following conditions and obligations:*

*Visibility Condition: Before the access is first used visibility splays as indicated on Drawing No. 1431/227.00 with an X dimension of 2.4m and a Y dimension of 25m and thereafter retained in the specified form. Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 2 Class A of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no obstruction over 0.6 metres high shall be erected, constructed, planted or permitted to grow within the areas of the visibility splays.*

*Reason: In the interests of highway safety in order to maintain intervisibility between highway users.*

*Parking Condition: The use shall not commence until the area(s) within the site shown on Drawing No. 1431/227.00 for the purposes of manoeuvring and parking of vehicles has been provided and thereafter that area(s) shall be retained and used for no other purposes.*

*Reason: To ensure that sufficient space for the on-site parking of vehicles is provided and maintained in order to ensure the provision of adequate on-site space for the parking and manoeuvring of vehicles where on-street parking and manoeuvring would be detrimental to highway safety to users of the highway.*

*Cycle Condition: The areas to be provided for secure covered storage cycle parking as shown on Drawing No. 1431/227.00 shall be provided in its entirety before the development is brought into use and shall be retained thereafter for no other purpose.*

*Reason: To ensure that the provision for cycle parking is provided in line with sustainable transport policies.*

*Bin Condition: The areas to be provided for presentation and storage of Refuse/Recycling bins as shown on Drawing No. 1431/2270.02 shall be provided in its entirety before the development is brought into use and shall be retained thereafter for no other purpose.*

*Reason: To ensure that refuse recycling bins are not stored on the highway causing obstruction and dangers for other users.*

### **Internal Consultee Responses**

#### **BMSDC Environmental Protection – Land Contamination**

*I can confirm that I have no comments to make and all issues were dealt with at the 2019 outline permission stage.*

#### **BMSDC Environmental Protection – Air Quality**

*I have no objections with regard to air quality.*

#### **BMSDC Public Realm**

*Public Realm Officers note that the central public open space has been replaced with a flood storage attenuation basin following consultation with the parish council. Public Realm Officers consider that this is not a suitable area for adoption by the District Council as its primary function is now drainage and flood storage.*

#### **BMSDC Heritage**

*This is the reserved matters application following recent outline approval for up to 28 dwellings (DC/19/04755). The issues of the Heritage Team's concern relate to the potential impact of the proposals on the setting and subsequently the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets in the vicinity, including the historic character of the green and its contribution to the assets.*

*This application follows outline reference DC/19/04755 where I raised concern regarding the principle. Prior to that there was an outline application for up to 10 dwellings (DC/18/00306) followed by a reserved matters application (DC/19/02020) – neither of which I supported due to concerns regarding the impact on the heritage assets.*

*Some aspects of the detailed design from the previous reserved matters application for 10 dwellings have been brought through into this scheme – such as a slightly simplified materials palette, willow hurdles and post and railing fencing. However, irrespective of the detailed design within the current reserved matters application, the principle remains harmful as I identified in my earlier correspondence on each application. The development would remain out of character with the rural location. It would continue to harm the settings of the assets and would appear as a suburban addition to the village which would conflict with the morphology of the green, thereby diminishing local distinctiveness and a sense of place.*

*As such, I consider the proposals would cause a low level of less than substantial harm to the non-designated and designated heritage assets. As a result, it would not accord with National and Local*

*Planning Policies relating to the historic built environment, and it is for these reasons that I do not support it. The harm identified should be weighed against public benefits in accordance with para.196 of the NPPF.*

## BMSDC Strategic Housing

### **1. Housing Need Information:**

- 1.1 *The Ipswich Housing Market Area, Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SMHA) document, updated in 2019, confirms a continuing need for housing across all tenures and a growing need for affordable housing.*
- 1.2 *The 2019 SHMA indicates that in Babergh there is a need for 110 new affordable homes per annum.*

### **2. Open Market homes.**

- 2.1 *The open market needs to address the growing demand for smaller homes for sale, both for younger people who may be newly forming households, but also for older people who are already in the property-owning market and require appropriate housing enabling them to downsize.*
- 2.2 *With an ageing population, both nationally and locally new homes should, wherever possible, be built to Lifetime-Homes standards and this can include houses, apartments and bungalows. It is noted bungalows are provided on this scheme.*
- 2.3 *The Council wishes to encourage the provision of homes built to Lifetime-Homes standards, as this will enable our aging population to remain longer in their homes.*
- 2.4 *Broadband and satellite facilities as part of the design for all tenures should be standard 2.5 All new properties need to have high levels of energy efficiency.*

### **3. Affordable Housing**

- 3.1 *The outline application secured 11 affordable homes. The indicative site plan dated Jan 2020 shows the layout and affordable housing mix of 2- and 3-bedroom homes located at plots 13 to 23. The site layout accompanying this application shows the affordable homes located at plots 17 to 27, the layout however is still acceptable. The following affordable dwellings types were agreed within the s106 legal agreement:*

*Affordable Rent Dwellings:*

*3 x 2b 4p houses*

*6 x 3b 5p houses*

*Shared Ownership Dwellings:*

*2 x 2b 4p houses*

- 3.2 *It appears from the accommodation schedule that the above is to be provided however we cannot ascertain the tenure of the affordable from the details submitted. We require clarification that the scheme meets the requirements of the s106 affordable housing mix as above.*

#### **4. Other requirements for affordable homes:**

- *Properties must be built to current Homes England and Nationally Described Space Standards March 2015.*
- *The council is granted 100% nomination rights to all the affordable units on initial lets and 100% on subsequent lets.*
- *The Council will not support a bid for Homes England grant funding on the affordable homes delivered as part of an open market development. Therefore, the affordable units on that part of the site must be delivered grant free.*
- *This development will need to ensure that the affordable units are “tenure blind” within the overall development*
- *It is preferred that the affordable units are transferred freehold to one of Babergh’s partner Registered Providers and for the avoidance of doubt this could include the Council itself.*

#### Place Services – Ecology

*We have reviewed the following documents submitted with this application relating to soft landscaping. This includes the Planting plan - Pr207-02 and Landscaping plan - Pr207-01a (Matt Lee Landscape Architecture Ltd, December 2020).*

*In addition, we have reviewed the Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy (Greenlight Environmental Consultancy Ltd, December 2020), submitted to discharge conditions 14, 26 & 27; the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Greenlight Environmental Consultancy Ltd, December 2020), submitted to discharge condition 15; and the Lighting Design for Biodiversity (Greenlight Environmental Consultancy Ltd, November 2020) and the External Lighting Plan (May 2021), submitted to discharge 16.*

*Furthermore, we have reassessed the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Greenlight Environmental Consultancy, September 2019), supplied by the applicant at outline stage, relating to the likely impacts of development on protected & Priority habitats and species.*

*It is indicated that we support the submitted soft landscaping. This includes appropriate planting specification and schedules, as well details of implementation of the indicated features to ensure that plants will establish successfully. We also support the submitted the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, which is set out suitable aftercare and management measures for the soft landscaping features within the site, as required under condition 15 of outline consent.*

*In addition, we approve of the Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy submitted to support this application. This includes appropriate details and locations for the following reasonable biodiversity enhancement measures:*

- *Five integrated bat boxes to be installed on the south/southeast aspects of the new dwellings*
- *Two standalone bat boxes to be installed on suitable trees within the plantation woodland*
- *Five integrated swift boxes to be installed on the northern aspects of the new dwellings*
- *Five small bird boxes to be installed on site*
- *Hedgehog Friendly Fencing to be incorporated throughout the site*

*Therefore, we are satisfied the proposals meet the requirements of conditions 14, 26 & 27 and will ensure that measurable biodiversity net gains are secured for this application, as outline under paragraph 174[d] of the NPPF.*

*In terms of the lighting plan, it is indicated that we support that locations of the external lighting, as well as the principles set out within the Lighting Design for Biodiversity (Greenlight Environmental*

Consultancy Ltd, November 2020). However, it is recommended that the designs and technical specification should be submitted for the proposed lighting to meet the requirements of the condition, which should be in line with details set out by the applicant's ecologist.

### *Recommendations*

We support the soft landscaping of this application and subject to the full implementation of the Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy (Greenlight Environmental Consultancy Ltd, December 2020), and the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Greenlight Environmental Consultancy Ltd, December 2020), we recommend the full discharge of conditions 14, 15, 26 & 27.

However, the lighting designs and technical specification should be submitted to meet the requirements of condition 16.

### **B: Representations**

At the time of writing this report at least 8 letters/emails/online comments have been received. It is the officer opinion that this represents 8 objections. A verbal update shall be provided as necessary.

Views and concerns are summarised below:-

- Impact on Ecology
- Residential amenity
- Layout
- Woodland impact
- Ground levels
- Dwelling heights
- SUDS overflow
- Development is out of keeping
- Overbearing
- Highway safety issues
- Lighting in the countryside
- Car parking
- Buffer zone between development and Dukes Meadow
- Lack of car charging points
- Archaeology
- Foul Drainage

(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**

<b>REF:</b> DC/17/05689	Outline Planning Application (Access to be considered) - Erection of 8no dwellings and construction of new vehicular access.	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 10.01.2018
<b>REF:</b> DC/18/00306	Outline Planning Application (Access to be considered) - Erection of up to 10 dwellings.	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 17.05.2018

<b>REF:</b> DC/19/02020	Submission of Details under Outline Planning Permission DC/18/00306 - Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for the erection of 10no dwellings.	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 18.09.2019
<b>REF:</b> DC/19/03902	Discharge of Conditions Application for DC/18/00306 - Condition 4 (Archaeological Works), Condition 6 (Landscape Protection) and Condition 9 (Lighting Design Scheme).	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 10.10.2019
<b>REF:</b> DC/19/04755	Outline Planning Application (Access to be considered all other matters reserved) - Erection of up to 28no. dwellings (Plots 5, 6 and 7 of Reserved Matters Permission DC/19/02020 to be repositioned/amended)	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 22.02.2021
<b>REF:</b> DC/19/05086	Discharge of Conditions Application for DC/18/00306 - Condition 11 (Details of Access) and Condition 12 (Surface Water Discharge).	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 31.01.2020
<b>REF:</b> DC/20/04207	Application for a Non-Material Amendment-Change of approved brick to Forterra Chelsea Smoked Soft Red Bricks.	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 23.10.2020
<b>REF:</b> DC/20/05457	Non-material Amendment to Outline Planning Permission DC/18/00306. Change of Finish to Road, Pavement and Driveways as follows:-Road - Change to Asphalt Tarmac finish. Pavement - Change to Asphalt finish. Driveways - Change to Marshalls Drivesett Tegula Original: 'Harvest' Permeable Block Paving.	<b>DECISION:</b> REF 17.12.2020
<b>REF:</b> DC/21/03113	Non-Material Amendment to DC/18/00306 and DC/19/02020 - Amendment to positions of Plots 05, 06 and 07 (as approved under Outline Application DC/19/04755).	<b>DECISION:</b> REF 23.06.2021
<b>REF:</b> DC/21/03660	Discharge of Conditions Application for DC/19/04755- Condition 10 (Parking), Condition 11 (Refuse Bins), Condition 12 (Construction Management Plan), Condition 17 (Levels), Condition 26 (Swift Boxes), Condition 27 (Hedgehog Fencing), Condition 28 (Rainwater Harvesting), Condition 29 (Electric Car Charging Points) and Condition 30 (Tree Survey)	<b>DECISION:</b> PCO
<b>REF:</b> DC/21/03719	Application under S73a for removal or variation of a condition following approval of	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 30.09.2021

DC/19/02020 dated 18/09/2019. Town and Country Planning Act 1990 Reserved Matters for 10 No dwellings. Variation of condition 2 (Approved Plans & Documents) - Amendment to positions of Plots 05, 06 and 07 including addition of single garage to Plot 06 and double garage to Plot 07 (as approved under Outline Application DC/19/04755). Additionally, change of surface material for the proposed driveways and change of fencing. Details as per drawing DAPA\_1431\_400\_00.

**REF:** DC/21/03720

Discharge of Conditions Application for DC/18/00306- Condition 15 (Surface Water Drainage Scheme), Condition 16 (Implementation, Maintenance and Management), Condition 17 (Sustainable Urban Drainage System) and Condition 19 (Foul Water Strategy)

**DECISION:** PCO

---

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

---

### **1.0 The Site and Surroundings**

- 1.1 The site is located in Great Green, Cockfield which is classed as a Hinterland Village under policy CS2 of the Babergh Core Strategy 2014. The application site is located outside of the defined Built Up Area Boundary (BUAB), but it abuts it on the eastern boundary.
- 1.2 The site is currently an unused agricultural field. The application site forms a parcel of land which shares an eastern boundary with Dukes Meadow (a mid to late-20th century housing development). There is a thick tree belt to the northern boundary of the site. Planning permission has been granted for residential development to the west of the site that is currently under construction. The access for the application is through this development for ten dwellings from Bury Road. A further development has been granted to the southern boundary.
- 1.3 The Grade II Listed Old House Farm is located to the east of the site and Green Farm to the south, with existing dwellings between the application site and the heritage asset.

### **2.0 The Proposal**

- 2.1 The application includes a total of 31 dwellings. Three of these fall within land to the west of this application site but are required to be re-positioned in order to gain access to the site for 28 dwellings.
- 2.2 The proposed housing mix is:

Market housing:  
7 x 3 bed/5person  
10 x 4 bed/8person

Affordable housing:  
5 x 2bed/4person  
6 x 3bed/5person

- 2.3 The floor area of the private dwellings would be 2283.3 square metres and would be subject to CIL contributions. The affordable dwellings would produce 821.7 square metres of floor area.
- 2.4 A total of 68 parking spaces are provided for dwellings with a further 8 visitors parking spaces, providing a total of 76 parking spaces on the site.
- 2.5 The site area is 1.77Ha, with a density of build of 16 dwellings per Hectares.
- 2.6 There is a range of building heights on the site:  
5 x single-storey  
3 x one-and-a-half-storey  
20 x two-storey
- 2.7 Garden sizes vary from 93 to 367 square metres.
- 2.8 The development is set around a central attenuation basin and dwellings back onto the site boundaries. Therefore, back-to-back distances are only relevant to plots along the eastern and southern side of the development. Plots 12-16 are proposed bungalows that back onto Dukes Meadow. The minimum back-to-back distance is 22 metres. However, because this is a single-storey dwelling, it is not considered to cause an overlooking issue. Plots 17-19 are proposed one-and-a-half-storeys high, with back-to-back distances of 40 metres. This is a distance that is considered to be acceptable in terms of privacy. Plots 20-22 back onto an area that has permission for dwellings that are not yet built and would have back-to-back distances of 17 metres. This is less acceptable but overlooking can be mitigated through a planting scheme.
- 2.8 The materials palette includes the use of red brick, cream render and black hardiplank to the walls and red plain tiles or grey plain tiles to the roofs.

### **3.0 The Principle of Development**

- 3.1 The principle of development has been established by the granting of outline planning permission under DC/19/04755 (Outline Planning Application (Access to be considered all other matters reserved) - Erection of up to 28no. dwellings (Plots 5, 6 and 7 of Reserved Matters Permission DC/19/02020 to be repositioned/amended).
- 3.2 This Reserved Matters application seeks agreement for Layout, Scale, Appearance and Landscaping and are discussed in the sections below.
- 3.3 Conditions on the outline that require consideration concurrent with the reserved matters application include the following and are delegated to officers, there are no outstanding objections other than further details being required for condition 19 (SUDS):
- 8. Estate Roads and Footpaths
  - 13. Construction Environmental Management Plan
  - 14. Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy
  - 15. Landscape Environmental Management Plan
  - 19. Surface Water Drainage Scheme

## 4.0 Layout

4.1 Two restrictive conditions formed part of the outline planning permission, both of which determine the layout of the site.

- **21. SPECIFIC RESTRICTION ON DEVELOPMENT: HOUSING MIX**  
*The reserved matters application shall use the housing mix stated on the Indicative Layout Plan No. 19/025-2H received on the 18th February 2020.*

*Reason - To ensure that the housing mix is appropriate to the needs of the village of Cockfield as set out in the Local Housing Needs Assessment which is a requirement of policy CS11 of the Babergh Core Strategy 2014.*

- **22. SPECIFIC RESTRICTION ON DEVELOPMENT: LAYOUT**  
*The reserved matters application shall reflect that of the Indicative Layout Plan No. 19/025-2H received on the 18th February 2020.*

*Reason - To ensure that the layout reflects the negotiation and requirements of Cockfield Parish Council and the Local Planning Authority in terms of protecting the residential amenity of surrounding properties.*

4.2 To clarify, this Reserved Matters application concerns the development of 28 dwellings. The three dwellings that are to be re-positioned from the site to the west have been considered under a separate S.73 application (DC/21/03719 which forms part of planning permission DC/19/02020 for the erection of 10 dwellings) for the final layout and has been granted.

This is the Indicative Site Plan 19/025-2H of outline planning permission DC/19/04755





- 4.3 The main areas of concern at outline stage related to the central public open space and the scale of the buildings that share a boundary with Dukes Meadow, along with the landscaping belt between the development and Dukes Meadow to protect residential amenity.
- 4.4 The site is accessed through the development for ten dwellings from Bury Road. The layout of the dwellings is very similar, with dwellings around the edge of the site and a central green space. The road now links around the green space and does not separate the affordable units from the larger market dwellings, with traffic being able to move around the site rather than a backwards and forwards movement past the affordable units.
- 4.5 The central green space is slightly smaller than shown on the indicative plan of the outline permission. Dwellings have been pushed towards the centre of the site which allows for greater back-to-back distances between Dukes Meadow and the development to the south of the site. This allows greater residential amenity for all properties and also allows for a minimum of 4 metres' landscaping buffer with Dukes Meadow. Overall, the proposed layout is considered to reflect the Indicative Site Plan of the outline permission and therefore complies with Condition 22.
- 4.6 The layout of the site shows the five bungalows on plots 12-16 which shares a boundary with Dukes Meadow. This was a matter which the Parish Council and developer negotiated during the application process of the outline permission. Plots 17-19 are one-and-a-half-storey high dwellings and form the corner of the site that abuts Dukes Meadow. The back-to-back distances are considered to be acceptable at 40 metres. The mix of dwellings being 5 x 2 beds, 13 x 3 beds

and 10 x 4 beds is consistent with the outline documentation and, therefore, is considered to comply with Condition 21 of the outline permission.

- 4.7 The green space also forms the SUDS attenuation basin. Although there have been some objections about this issue, it was always the intention that this area would be used for drainage. During the course of the outline application process, the green space which included the attenuation basin was moved from the north-eastern corner of the site to a more central location. It is usual practice for the green area to be used for drainage and often these are dry basins which only collect water during very heavy rainfall. In this particular case, the basin will be wet and is likely to contain water whenever it rains, before it drains away off site.
- 4.8 SUDS was an issue that required attention at Reserved Matters stage and condition 19 of the outline permission required details of drainage to be submitted concurrent with the Reserved Matters application. The SCC Floods Team has raised a holding objection because not all of the criteria set out in the condition have been met. However, there is just one outstanding issue (an ongoing management arrangement) that requires further details before condition 19 can be fully discharged. Therefore, the Reserved Matters application cannot be approved until all of the points of Condition 19 have been approved by SCC Floods Team.
- 4.9 Cockfield Parish Council has raised an objection to the attenuation forming the public open space. National Planning Policy considers that SUDS form green spaces and are particularly important for amenity and biodiversity. The central green space allows the whole site visual amenity to a green area which will be planted with trees. In terms of exercising and playing, the wide-open space on Great Green is linked to the site with a footpath and is easily accessible. This footpath would also allow residents of Great Green to enter the site for walks/runs and benefit from a slightly different green area which contains water in a safe environment which has natural surveillance from the swellings which overlook it. Visitor parking is also available around the green.
- 4.10 SCC Highways Authority raised an objection to the initial submission and further details of estate roads and footpaths were submitted showing the dimensions of the proposed roads and footways and forward visibility. Full details of finishes and construction will be agreed under s38 of the Highways Act 1980 if the developer wishes the roads and footways to be adopted by SCC as the Highway Authority. Dwellings without garages have sheds suitable for cycle storage and parking. SCC Highways have no objection to the scheme and the proposed complies with current Parking Standards.

## **5.0 Scale**

- 5.1 The scale of the development was controlled by condition 22 of the outline permission which required single-storey dwellings along the sensitive boundary with Dukes Meadow as shown on the Indicative Site Plan. This has been carried through to the Reserved Matters stage and also includes a row of three one-and-a-half-storey dwellings in the south-eastern corner of the site. The remainder of the site is of no more than two storeys.
- 5.2 The scale of the dwellings reflects the character of the site of ten dwellings currently under construction to the west of the site and also the dwellings in Dukes Meadow which have two storeys. Dwellings are one deep, set around the edge of the site and would not give an impression of being densely developed. Most of the two-storey dwellings are along the northern boundary which have a backdrop of the mature tree belt which screens the development from wider landscape views. The scale of the dwellings proposed is considered to be appropriate in this location.

- 5.3 Concerns have been raised during the application process of soil being moved around the site. A Levels condition formed part of the outline planning permission and details to discharge condition 17 have been received and are under consideration.
- 5.4 It is noted that comments received through publicity have referred to spoil being moved within this site and Officers are liaising with the Enforcement team in order to establish the position.

## **6.0 Appearance**

- 6.1 The appearance of the development is similar to the scheme for ten dwellings to the west of the site and, therefore, allows for a general flow of design when moving through the two developments from Bury Road. The materials palette is limited which is helpful in creating a sense of place. Vehicles can move around the site in a free manner without coming to a dead end that requires turning vehicles around which adds to this sense of flow.
- 6.2 The central green area gives the development a sense of openness and space, which is correct in this edge of village location with dwellings backing onto the wide tree belt along the northern boundary. This gives the development a green backdrop and contains development in this part of Great Green.
- 6.3 The house designs are considered to be acceptable and the change of scale from bungalows to two-storey dwellings is transitioned through a “steppingstone” of the row of three one-and-a-half-storey dwellings. This allows a gentle rise of scale within the development without it jarring with the appearance of the development.

## **7.0 Landscaping**

- 7.1 Landscaping of the development is an important factor that was raised at Outline stage. The site is contained on the northern boundary by the wide tree belt. Condition 30 of the outline permission required that a tree survey be carried out. This is being dealt with under a separate discharge of conditions application DC/21/03660. The Council’s Arboricultural Officer has had the opportunity to respond on this condition and is content for this condition to be discharged.
- 7.2 A wide landscaping belt will be introduced to the eastern boundary with Dukes Meadow. This will be approximately 4 metres wide and will contain a variety of trees to provide existing occupants with a green barrier between the development and their rear gardens.
- 7.3 The central green space will be planted with trees to help create visual amenity for residents and also to encourage biodiversity into the site.
- 7.4 The Council’s Ecologist supports the submitted soft landscaping scheme. This includes appropriate planting specification and schedules, as well as details of implementation of the indicated features to ensure that plants will establish successfully. They also support the submitted Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, which sets out suitable aftercare and management measures for the soft landscaping features within the site, as required under condition 15 of the outline consent.
- 7.5 In addition, the Ecologist approves of the Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy submitted to support this application. This includes appropriate details and locations for the following reasonable biodiversity enhancement measures:

- Five integrated bat boxes to be installed on the southern and south-eastern aspects of the new dwellings
- Two standalone bat boxes to be installed on suitable trees within the plantation woodland
- Five integrated swift boxes to be installed on the northern aspects of the new dwellings
- Five small bird boxes to be installed on site
- Hedgehog-Friendly Fencing to be incorporated throughout the site

7.6 Therefore, the Ecologist is satisfied the proposals meet the requirements of conditions 14, 26 & 27 (being dealt with under the separate Discharge of Conditions application DC/21/03660) and will ensure that measurable biodiversity net gains are secured for this application, as outlined under paragraph 174[d] of the NPPF.

## **8.0 Heritage Issues**

8.1 This application follows outline reference DC/19/04755 where the Heritage Team raised concerns regarding the principle. Prior to that there was an outline application for up to 10 dwellings (DC/18/00306) followed by a reserved matters application (DC/19/02020) – neither of which the Heritage Team supported due to concerns regarding the impact on the heritage assets.

8.2 Some aspects of the detailed design from the previous reserved matters application for 10 dwellings have been brought through into this scheme – such as a slightly simplified materials palette, willow hurdles and post and railing fencing. However, irrespective of the detailed design within the current reserved matters application, the Heritage Team considers that the principle remains harmful as it identified in its earlier correspondence on each application. The development would remain out of character with the rural location. It would continue to harm the settings of the assets and would appear as a suburban addition to the village which would conflict with the morphology of the green, thereby diminishing local distinctiveness and a sense of place.

8.3 As such, the Heritage Team consider the proposals would cause a low level of less than substantial harm to the non-designated and designated heritage assets. As a result, it would not accord with National and Local Planning Policies relating to the historic built environment, and it is for these reasons that they do not support it. The harm identified should be weighed against public benefits in accordance with para.202 of the NPPF.

8.4 During the outline application the public benefits were considered and weighed against the harm to the setting of the heritage assets. It was considered that the public benefits of affordable housing, public open space, highways improvements (with a financial contribution of £18060 secured under a s.106 agreement) and biodiversity enhancements outweighed the less than substantial harm.

## **9.0 Sustainability**

9.1 As part of the sustainability strategy, electric charging points are proposed to all secure garages.

The key sustainability features of the development include:

- Fabric-first approach to sustainable construction, increasing insulation and air tightness in the building envelope
- Maximising the controlled use of passive solar energy in the layout and orientation of buildings and windows
- Maximising the use of passive ventilation
- Using energy-efficient window glazing and frames

- Installing energy-efficient lighting and appliances, including washing machines and dishwashers
- Water butt rainwater harvesting with all plots with private amenity
- Dual and low flush toilets
- Flow restriction on piped water supplies to sinks, basins, showers and aerated taps

## **10.0 Parish Council Comments**

- 10.1 Two Parish Councils commented on the application – Cockfield and Bradfield St Clare.
- 10.2 Cockfield Parish Council raised concerns about the layout and detailing of the scheme being significantly different to that approved under the outline permission that it, and Planning Officers, worked hard to negotiate with the developer. However, the site layout at outline stage was indicative and conditions were put in place that reserved matters should reflect this. It is the opinion of officers that the relevant conditions have been met on this point.
- 10.3 The Parish Council raised concerns over parking. The site layout demonstrates that current Parking Standards have been met and the SCC Highway Authority has not raised an objection to the amended drawings.
- 10.4 Concerns have been raised about the SUDS attenuation basin and public open space. This has been discussed above. The open space will contain trees and water and is considered to enhance biodiversity and will give visual amenity to the site.
- 10.5 Foul drainage has been raised by the Parish Council on behalf of a resident in Dukes Meadow. Anglian Water will be responsible for safe and appropriate connection to the mains sewers.
- 10.6 Bradfield St Clare Parish Council raised concerns over highway safety on the roads around the nearby villages. Although the comments are noted within this report, the issues raised should be taken up with Suffolk County Council in order to obtain speed limit reductions. It is acknowledged that there will be an increase in traffic movement during the construction phase and also after occupation. Highway safety is ultimately in the remit of the Highway Authority which, in this case, has raised no objection to the scheme.

---

## **PART FOUR – CONCLUSION**

---

### **11.0 Planning Balance and Conclusion**

- 11.1 The scheme is considered to be acceptable. Detailing in the layout and mix of dwellings reflects that agreed at outline stage and was required by condition.
- 11.2 Details for estate road, CEMP, Biodiversity enhancement strategy, LEMP and SUDS that were secured by condition to be provided concurrent with the reserved matters application have been approved by statutory consultees with the exception of part of the SUDS condition 19. The details required will need to be provided prior to the granting of this reserved matters application.
- 11.3 In all other respects the reserved matters are considered to comply with local and national policies noted above.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

---

That authority be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer to grant reserved matters approval once the outstanding SUDS information has been received and confirmed as compliant with current policies by the County Floods and Water Team and that such consent be subject to conditions including:

- Approved Plans
- Visibility Splays
- Parking
- Cycle
- Bins