

Design Policy Review

Submission of details application (Reserved Matters) and Discharge of Conditions 11 and 12 for Outline Planning Permission DC/17/02760. Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale to be considered for the erection of up to 69no dwellings, open space and associated infrastructure.

Planning permission DC/17/02760 was granted for up 69 Dwellings and included Access. For reference "Access", means the accessibility to and within the site, for vehicles, cycles and pedestrians in terms of the positioning and treatment of access and circulation routes and how these fit into the surrounding access network. This can not now be assessed under the reserved matters before members.

Since the outline planning permission that established the maximum number of dwellings, principle of development, expectations of future reserved matters and access the Botesdale and Rickinghall Neighbourhood Plan (NP) was adopted.

The deferment of the reserved matters was to allow officers to provide analysis of the design policy of the NP. It is noted that the Parish have provided their own analysis helpfully and so this is reviewed as well.

Outline v Reserved Matters

Pages 1 to 3 of the Parish Review compare the reserved matters application to the indicative details under the outline permission. There are differences between the current reserved matters application and the outline and this is often the case. There were no design requirements secured by the outline permission as layout, appearance and other matters were reserved, but also no specific criteria were set either. For example, distance to existing dwellings, number of storeys etc. On this basis this analysis that compares the outline and reserved matter is set aside as the developer was not under any obligation to stay with the indicative plan of the outline permission and was free to consider other layouts. The Local Planning Authority is free to consider the reserved matters provided on their merits except for the maximum number of dwellings and access not reserved.

NP Policy B&R 7

The Parish review provide that reference of this policy being the allocation of the site has not been referenced and the proposal is contrary to this policy as the proposal fails to meet the policy. The policy provides:

Policy B&R 7 - Land south of Diss Road. A site of 3.53 hectares south of Diss Road and as shown on Map 13 is allocated for:

- a) Approximately 69 dwellings including 35% affordable housing; and*
- b) Public open space including children's play provision in accordance with the Fields in Trust recommended benchmark guidelines.*

The development of the site must provide a footpath and cyclepath link to Chapel Lane and screen planting using native species to the boundary between the site and both Park View and Mill Road.

In terms of a) of policy B&R 7, the outline permission (and by default the reserved matters) fully complies and continues to propose 69 dwellings with 35% affordable housing.

In terms of b), no public open space or play area provision was secured nor the extent of such defined under the Outline permission and can not be secured now as it is not a reserved matter for consideration on its own. However, despite no requirement, the reserved matters do provide public open space, but no play provision. Had the Neighbourhood Plan been in place for the outline this would have been a matter contrary to policy in part without the children's play provision, but this was not the case as the consideration of the Outline did not have the NP allocation in place in time.

The final part (not given a letter) of this policy provides the need for a footpath and cycle path link to Chapel Lane. This has been secured as part of the "access" under the outline permission and so is not a matter for consideration now.

The very last provision (not labelled) is for native species between the site and both Park View and Mill Road. This wording is a little unhelpful as "between the site" implies outside the site and beyond the control of this application site, but it is assumed this is meant to mean along the boundaries of the site. On this basis the boundary to Park View has a proposed hedge and there would be no issue to ensure this is a native hedge as part of the landscaping reserved matters application proposal. Mill Road to the south is not the direct boundary to the site as there is a field not part of the site between the site and road. However, in any event the southern boundary towards Mill Road has trees included and since the members saw the plans this has been increased significantly. It can be secured that this planting is native.

On this basis the proposal fulfils the criteria of B&R7, with the exception of play provision that was not a requirement at the time of the Outline planning permission being determined.

NP Policy B&R 9

The Parish response also provides that the proposal needs to consider NP Policy B&R 9. This policy provides:-

Policy B&R 9- Housing Mix. In all housing developments of ten or more homes, there shall be an emphasis on providing a higher proportion of three bedroomed homes within the scheme, unless it can be demonstrated that the particular circumstances relating to the tenure of the housing dictate otherwise or where such provision is demonstrated to not be in accordance with the latest available housing needs information for the Plan area.

This reserved matters does not need to consider this policy on housing mix (tenure) as it is not a reserved matters for consideration and was not secured under the Outline permission. It was not secured under the outline permission as this NP policy was not in place at the time of that decision and so does not form an expectation of the reserved matters.

However, the proposed housing mix does in fact conform to the requirement of the NP by having a higher proportion of three bedroomed homes (22units) proposed compared to other units of other bedroom numbers proposed. On this basis the proposal is full compliance with policy B&R 9.

NP Policy B&R 10

This policy has two requirements. Firstly, all dwellings must conform with nationally described space standards. Second, there should be provision for cover for cycle and wheelie bins.

The development does comply with nationally described space standards. However, as no provision for this was secured under the outline permission and this is not a reserved matter this can not be considered under the reserved matters application proposal now in any event.

The proposal does not provide “cover/s” for cycle and wheelie bins and again this was not secured as a requirement under the Outline permission. Therefore, the expectation for these matters to form reserved matters to be judged was not reserved or otherwise secured for later consideration. It is further noted that this policy states “should” and so is not regarded as an absolute requirement for development to comply with.

NP Policy B&R 15

This policy deals with the design considerations and was the reason for deferral. This along with Appendix 4 of the NP will be reviewed further below.

Design and Access Statement

The Parish review document as well as the policy provision of the NP provides that the application should have had a Design and Access Statement. The planning permission under the Outline Permission as a major development did have a Design and Access statement. However, there is no legal requirement or any other requirement for a Design and Access statement for a reserved matters application. Accordingly the NP document and Parish Council have worked on the false assumption on the matter of a Design and Access statement.

NPPF and National Design Code.

The Parish response notes the change to the latest version of the NPPF (July 2021) and National Design Code. The parish response does reference Tree lined streets stating that the proposed development does not provide any.

On the issue of Trees Para 131 states the following:-

131. Trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments, and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that new streets are tree-lined*, that opportunities are taken to incorporate trees elsewhere in developments (such as parks and community orchards), that appropriate measures are in place to secure the long-term maintenance of newly-planted trees, and that existing trees are retained wherever possible. Applicants and local planning authorities should work with highways officers and tree officers to ensure that the right trees are planted in the right places, and solutions are found that are compatible with highways standards and the needs of different users.

* Unless, in specific cases, there are clear, justifiable and compelling reasons why this would be inappropriate.

It is noted that this guidance for trees is recent and would not have been a consideration of the outline permission granted nor the allocation of the NP. On this basis this is a provision unexpected by all parties.

There are many questions to consider in respect of this provision of the new NPPF. How many trees means a street is tree lined, what spacing is acceptable, what about unadopted streets, does the tree need to be in the street or acceptable in the front garden that is part of the street frontage?

The expectations and standards of this provision has not been tested and will require careful consideration, not least by the highways authority for the future. Policy teams will need to consider if allocations are large enough to include this provision and the likely road spacing required. However, this is not an absolute requirement as the provision allows for consideration of trees in the right location and in some cases, trees are not appropriate.

In terms of the reserved matters before members, all roads will be tree lined in varying ways. Not all roads will have trees in the street, some are alongside the road and others are set in front gardens, but at this time there is nothing to say this does not comply as tree lined.

NP Policy B&R 15 and Appendix 4 Checklist

Policy B&R 15 is a long policy and the provisions are broken down into a table for ease below. The policy provides that planning applications should and not shall or must demonstrate the criteria of the policy and appendix 4 (considered further in this report).

NP B&R 15	Officer Review for Case
recognise and address the key features, characteristics, landscape/building character, local distinctiveness and special qualities of the area and/or building as identified in the Character Assessment and, where necessary, prepare a landscape character appraisal to demonstrate this;	The Character Assessment referred to by this policy is assumed to be the Historic Character Assessment prepared for the village and not Suffolk's Character Assessment. This places the site in two zones for landscape and in Area 2. Nothing is identified in terms of buildings as this area is open countryside. The openness is noted, but the site is also allocated in the NP and clearly labelled as a housing area.
maintain or create the villages' sense of place and/or local character avoiding, where possible, cul-de-sac developments which do not reflect the lane hierarchy and form of the settlement;	The term village sense of place is a judgement. In terms of cul de sac, this site can not avoid being a cul de sac as the allocation in the NP specifically constraints the site to form this arrangement with one access, including the location of open space and SuDs that are complied with. Essentially the allocation of the NP conflicts with this policy in this regard.
not involve the loss of gardens and important open, green or landscaped areas which make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of that part of the village;	This proposal does not involve the loss of gardens or important space defined and this would also be difficult to argue as it is now an NP allocated site for housing.
incorporate sustainable design and construction measures and energy efficiency measures including, where feasible, ground/air source heat pumps, solar panels and grey / rainwater harvesting;	Condition 18 of the Outline Planning Permission secures a scheme for sustainability and energy strategy prior to commencement and on this basis this point is satisfied.
taking mitigation measures into account, not affect adversely: - any historic character, architectural or archaeological heritage assets of the site and its surroundings, including those locally identified	It is not considered that there are significant heritage matters against any reserved matters. Amenities will be dealt with by the main report.

<p>heritage assets listed in Appendix 3 and subject to Policy B&R 1 3; important landscape characteristics including trees and ancient hedgerows and other prominent topographical features as set out in the Character Assessment; identified important views into, out of or within the village as identified on the Policies Map;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sites, habitats, species and features of ecological interest; - the amenities of adjacent areas by reason of noise, smell, vibration, overlooking, overshadowing, loss of light, other pollution (including light pollution), or volume or type of vehicular activity generated; and/or residential amenity; 	
<p>not locate sensitive development where its users and nearby residents would be significantly and adversely affected by noise, smell, vibration, or other forms of pollution from existing sources, unless adequate and appropriate mitigation can be implemented;</p>	<p>This is not considered to be a matter in conflict and is picked up in the main report.</p>
<p>produce designs that respect the character, scale, height, density of the locality;</p>	<p>The development is at a density defined by the allocation and so considered to meet local expectation of density. The scale and height is mainly two storey and would be similar to adjacent existing development that ranges between bungalow and two storey.</p>
<p>produce designs, in accordance with standards, that maintain or enhance the safety of the highway network ensuring that all vehicle parking is provided in accordance with adopted guidance and designed to be integrated into the development without creating an environment dominated by vehicles and seek always to ensure satisfactory permeability through new housing areas, connecting any new development into the heart of the existing settlement;</p>	<p>In this case the proposal meets the requirements of the guidance available in terms of parking standards and meets the requirement to connect to the heart of the settlement via the footpath/cycle way provision proposed.</p> <p>If the environment is car dominated is a judgement and in a scheme of this size will be different in different locations. Some car dominance did occur in part to ensure triple parking and rear parking courts are avoided. Since the presentation to members at the last committee the plans have been altered to significantly reduce the amount of car dominance and increase front garden areas. This is a positive change, and it is not considered sufficient to refuse given the extent of green frontage and landscaping now proposed.</p>
<p>wherever possible ensure that development faces onto existing lanes retaining the rural character and creates cross streets or new back streets in keeping with the settlement's hierarchy of routes;</p>	<p>This is not possible with the location of this development as there are no existing lane.</p>
<p>not result in water run-off that would add-to or create surface water flooding.</p>	<p>This is dealt with via conditions on surface water drainage and an attenuation is a part of the scheme as well as the allocation. On this basis this is considered to be address</p>
<p>incorporate 'Dementia Friendly Design Principles' in the design of open space and public areas</p>	<p>The LPA has not been made aware of any conflict.</p>

Appendix 4 has to be considered alongside Policy 15 and considered below.

NP Checklist	Officer Review
Integrate with existing paths, streets, circulation networks and patterns of activity	Access was a matter for the outline planning permission for connection to existing streets and so not a matter for consideration now under the reserved matters. However, connection to existing paths are secured. In terms of layout avoidance of escape routes is also a security matter and a balance between access and enclosure of space is a fine judgement.
Reinforce or enhance the established village character of streets, squares and other spaces	<p>Unlike the historic parts of the village, this development has to comply with parking standards. Taking the development as a whole the Streets are mainly tree lined and has a balance of landscape frontages as well as some car frontages that ensures triple parking and courtyards are not featured.</p> <p>Given the location, this space is separate from the historic village and will have its own sense of place. It does not seek to repeat squares and other spaces of the village, except at the point of connection. The site is not related otherwise to those existing spaces or the high street to enhance them in any form given the location away from those areas.</p>
Respect the rural character of views and gaps	<p>Views in the NP are identified (Including Mill Road) and this development will disrupt these view regardless of form the development might take. As it was allocated for housing and unrestricted in scale it was expected to interrupt the current view in policy terms. The value of the identified view did not ultimately resist the allocation made and it was adopted.</p> <p>Landscape is proposed on the boundaries of the site and in respect of Mill Road you also need to account for the remaining field between the site and Mill Road that provides reasonable distance before available public views.</p>
Harmonise and enhance existing settlement in terms of physical form, architecture and land use	The immediate development to the north of the site is of its time and not considered appropriate to copy. The area has good quality historic architectural within the village, but it would be inappropriate to copy that directly and dilute its contribution or create a false historic village to the detriment of the village character. The concluded design is not considered to be detrimental to the village, in fact is an improvement over more recent development nearby and provides dwellings of interest. The checklist does not provide that house designs from other places can not be used and if these are good then should be considered on their merit in the context of this area.
Relate well to local topography and landscape features, including prominent ridge lines and long distance views	There is not conflict beyond the allocation made as set out previously and if that is a conflict then the checklist should not be applied to allocated sites or would represent a conflict within the NP.
Reflect, respect and reinforce local architecture and historic distinctiveness	The buildings are not contemporary to conflict with the intention of reflection of local architecture nor false historic forms to compete with the village and so this leaves the middle ground as proposed. The dwellings include a range of features and detailing.
Retain and incorporate important existing features into the development	This is an open field.

Respect surrounding buildings in terms of scale, height, form and massing	In officer opinion the proposal meets this requirement, but notes development is not similar to bungalows adjacent being housing. If this were a development of all bungalows it would also fail in design terms and not be able to fit on the site. The form of the development does not compete or dominant the area and current form of the village.
Adopt contextually appropriate materials and details	Materials details are considered acceptable and provided now since the deferral.
Provide adequate open space for the development in terms of both quantity and quality	The development provides the open space as shown on the indicative plan in the NP, despite no requirement for it secured by the outline. The Parish response accepts the open space is complied with. The allocation may refer to play space dealt with earlier in this report, but the design checklist does not and so in terms of the checklist the design fully complies with this point.
Incorporate necessary services and drainage infrastructure without causing unacceptable harm to retained features	This is proposed and there is no known conflicts.
Ensure all components e.g. buildings, landscapes, access routes, parking and open space are well related to each other	This is considered to be proposed and officers are unaware of any specific areas that fail to achieve this.
Make sufficient provision for sustainable waste management (including facilities for kerbside collection, waste separation and minimisation where appropriate) without adverse impact on the street scene, the local landscape or the amenities of neighbours	This considered proposed and/or conditioned.
Positively integrate energy efficient technologies	This is conditioned under the outline permission and not a matter for reserved matters in any event.
Does it favour accessibility and permeability over cul-de- sac models? If not, the Design and Access Statement should state why.	The Checklist assumes all development needs a Design and Access Statement. Very few developments doneed this as government has reduced this requirement significantly a few years ago. It is recommended that this is changed in the NP in the future. In terms of accessibility and permeability:- - The Checklist asks if the design favours accessibility and permeability over cul de sac arrangements, it does not say one or the other model is wrong or bad nor seeks to prevent one model over the other. - The allocation is a very specific area and requires a long access road and only one access for vehicles and so can only be a cul de sac estate arrangement given the constraint of the allocation. The cul de sacs proposed are short routes and not unreasonable in walking distance. It is not considered necessary to impose more connections than show that might result in alleyways and allow escape routes for crime.

Do the new points of access and street layout have regard for all users of the development; in particular pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities?	This is considered to be met.
Are the essential characteristics of the existing street pattern; are these reflected in the proposal?	The proposal has its own sense of place away from the village and the existing street pattern.
Does the Design and Access Statement identify how the new design or extension integrates with the existing street arrangement?	A design and access statement is not required with this application and so this criteria is void. However, the development does not connect to the existing street arrangement, nor does it extend it beyond the connection of a footway and small green (considered a positive addition to that existing area).
Are the new points of access appropriate in terms of patterns of movement?	In accord with the allocation and Outline. Not a matter for this reserved matters.
Do the points of access conform to the statutory technical requirements?	In accord with the allocation and Outline. Not a matter for this reserved matters.
Does the Design and Access Statement identify the particular characteristics of this area which have been taken into account in the design?	The D&A is not required and so this criteria is void. However, instead if we ask has the application identified particular characters of this area and have been taken into account? Then the answer is yes. However, it is not sought to copy the immediate prevailing adjacent character as it is of its time.
Does the proposal maintain or enhance any views identified in the Neighbourhood Plan or views in general?	The current field will be replaced with housing and so the view will change is already agreed to change. The only way to avoid this conflict would not be to develop any housing on the site at the density and numbers allocated by the NP. This is a conflict of the NP in this regard and the allocation and outline permission are considered to have dealt with this matter. Is there sufficient landscaping or not is a matter of judgement to be considered.
How does the proposal impact on existing views which are important to the area and how are these views incorporated in the design?	As above.
Can any new views be created?	Yes, the development will lead to the improved entrance of the village with a significant landscaped attenuation basin as set out in the NP allocation. The site set out an improvement to Chapel Lane with a new open space to serve the existing development and new development, essentially form a new connection and small village green pocket area.
Does the Design and Access Statement state how the proposal affects the trees on or adjacent to the site?	Again, a Design and Access statement is not required. Instead, landscaping is part of the reserved matters and plans clearly show how the development will affect trees and so this is considered to comply with this checklist point.
Does the Design and Access Statement state how the proposal considers the site in the widest context?	This point of the checklist is not understood and it is not clear what design element this is referring to. The site in a policy context is an allocated site. The site is on the edge of the village and in the countryside.

<p>Has the impact on the landscape quality of the area been taken into account?</p>	<p>Landscape statements, plans, planting schedules as required for the reserved matters application are all provided. The field currently part of the landscape quality of the area is agreed in principle for removal by the Outline and NP allocation and so has been taken into account.</p>
<p>In rural locations has the impact of the development on the tranquillity of the area been fully considered?</p>	<p>As above, but as the principle of 69 dwellings was established at outline and is also the allocation, the impact on the general tranquillity is considered to have been considered. Clearly there will be a significant difference from a field to a housing estate planned for that will have domestic noise and disturbance associated.</p>
<p>How does the proposal affect the character of a rural location?</p>	<p>The edges of the development are all landscaped or have significantly existing landscaping or will not otherwise affect rural character. It is appreciated people will have varying and different opinions on this point.</p> <p>Northwest (Chapel Lane) – Is open and will be connected to a built up area.</p> <p>North (Park View) – Already a built hard edge as the back of bungalows and a hedge is proposed along this boundary.</p> <p>Northeast (Access) – A strong landscaped frontage is proposed to the built form, but the allocation essentially restricts what can be achieved given the long urbanised access road needed.</p> <p>East /Southeast – Existing strong landscape boundary</p> <p>Southern/Southwest new boundary to divide field and landscaped. A remaining field and an existing hedge adjacent Mill Road and so this is not considered to be a hard edge. Otherwise the site is adjacent an existing garden.</p>
<p>Is there adequate amenity space for the development?</p>	<p>The proposal is in line with the indicative amount shown on the allocation. Play equipment is not a criteria of the checklist, only the allocation and this has been explored earlier.</p>
<p>Does the new development respect and enhance existing amenity space?</p>	<p>In this case it is considered that existing amenity for Chapel Lane residents is increased as this area will gain an open space to enjoy and overlook. The entrance of the village and amenity enjoyed as you approach the village will be improved with the provision of the landscape attenuation basin site.</p>
<p>Have opportunities for enhancing existing amenity spaces been explored?</p>	<p>Not beyond the allocation indicative plan and these have been complied with. Nothing else was secured under the Outline and not available to be secured under the reserved matter.</p>
<p>Will any communal amenity space be created? If so, how this will be used by the new owners and how will it be managed?</p>	<p>Amenity space will be available and likely to be private management company. This is a matter for the owner to resolve.</p>
<p>What is the arrival point, how is it designed?</p>	<p>This site has two arrival points. The first is the attenuation basin along the road frontage and it appears to be agreed that this is acceptable and will provide a positive landscaped area. Once you drive past this you are presented with a long road leading to the built form of the housing and essentially this creates a second arrival point.</p>

	<p>In urban design terms it is agreed that this welcome is not a grand entrance, a gateway and is instead neutral. The reason for this is that the allocation provides the open space should be in front of the development and the developer has followed this indicative plan. Also the design checklist promotes development in keeping with the scale of surroundings and soft edges. Therefore, three storey landmark buildings are avoided and if proposed would likely offend rural design principles, harden the edge of development and other criteria of the checklist. To do more would likely cause more offence and so a “bland” frontage that doesn’t cause planning harm has been proposed. If the allocation was larger and the access drive could be better integrated as part of a larger site there may be other options, but this is not the application to be decided and beyond the allocation made.</p>
Does the proposal maintain or enhance the existing gaps between villages?	It is an allocation, but also does not affect the gaps significantly.
Does the proposal affect or change the setting of a listed building?	Not adversely
Is the landscaping to be hard or soft?	To avoid a hard edge, a reasonable landscape buffer is provided to the second arrival point and there is the open space area in front as well in part. Thus soft for the most part where appropriate.
What are the typical groupings of buildings?	<p>The smaller and higher density housing are placed to the west to be closer to the settlement. The less dense and larger house types are found more to the west to account for the rural edge.</p> <p>The checklist simply asks what is the grouping, but provides no criteria to judge the good, the bad or the ugly in this regard. Officers have considered what alternative layouts may be available, but the set access points indicated by the outline and allocation to act as a considerable constraint along with the sewage works restriction zone. There is also a need to maintain a rural sense compared to a urban development if elements such as town squares were introduced. If the open space from the front was moved into the development this may provide opportunities for different spaces within the development, but the developer has followed the allocation.</p>
How have the existing groupings been reflected in the proposal?	Not sure that this is relevant for a new built allocated site as opposed to perhaps the redevelopment of an existing site.
Are proposed groups of buildings offering variety and texture to the townscape?	There is a significant range of house types and materials.
What affect would the proposal have on the streetscape?	None on existing, beyond landscaping.
Does the proposal maintain the pattern of development emanating from the principal route through Rickinghall and Botesdale?	No, but not harm in planning terms is identified given the allocation in this regard.
Does the proposal overlook any adjacent properties	Direct overlooking is avoided, but indirect overlooking is possible for some units along the northern boundary. Given the orientation and distance your officers do not considered this to be a matter that warrants refusal that would be likely to be resist appeal. Further amendments on this has been achieved since the deferral.

What are the characteristics of the building line?	The provision of front gardens in this development provide a balance in terms of avoiding the car dominate issue and provides the means to allow for SuDs that historic dwellings in the village would not have had to take into account.
How has the building line been respected in the proposals?	For the most part there is no existing “building line” to consider, except opposite Chapel Lane. Chapel Lane dwellings are set along the road, Plots 43 to 46 will be set back with open space in front. While this is not in keeping with the “building line” it follows the indicative plan in the allocation of the NP.
How has the building line been respected in the proposals?	As above.
What are the characteristics of the roofline?	Similar scale and massing throughout. .
Have the proposals paid careful attention to height, form, massing and scale?	There is a range of units in terms of height form, massing and scale that are not considered out of keeping with the prevailing adjacent development. To increase the height would represent a shift to more urbanising scale and mass. If there is a specific issue on this, officer need to be directed to the relevant plots.
If a higher than average building(s) is proposed, what would be the reason for making the development higher?	It is considered that no higher than average dwellings have been proposed.
Would a higher development improve the scale of the overall area?	A few higher dwellings would add more variation and interest and perhaps improve the second arrival point, but also this may be urbanising and result in other design issues. Therefore, the conclusion is no.
Is the choice of materials, unit size and colour tone appropriate to Rickinghall and Botesdale?	Yes, in officer opinion.
Are the buildings in block corners designed to have windows addressing both sides of the corner?	When relevant to do so. The risk with this approach is that this appears as an after thought and poor in appearance. Instead, it is preferred to ensure the siting of the buildings is suitable and end of dwellings/corners if exposed are landscaped and integrated. Some further amendments have been secured on this basis.
Have blank walls been avoided?	Blank walls in some cases are necessary to avoid direct overlooking.
Are landscape and boundary treatments enhancing the corner of a block?	Yes
What is the distinctive material in the area, if any?	Red brick common.
Does the proposed material harmonise with the local material?	No as this is not considered suitable.
Does the proposal use high quality materials	Yes
Have the details of the windows, doors, eaves and roof details been addressed in the context of the overall design?	Plans for each dwelling and garage are provided and these include doors, eaves and roofs.

Does the new proposed materials respect or enhance the existing area or adversely change its character?	Compared to adjacent development these will be a significant improvement.
What parking solutions have been considered?	The parking solution is as proposed. Officers are not aware of other approaches and it complies with the highway standards.
Are the car spaces located and arranged in a way that is not dominant or detrimental to the sense of place?	In some parts no to avoid parking courts and triple parking. In most of the development, yes.
Has planting been considered to soften the presence of cars?	Yes
Does the proposed car parking compromise the amenity of adjoining properties?	No the proposed car parking will not affect adjoining "existing" properties to the development.
Does the proposal harmonise with the adjacent properties? This means that it follows the height, massing and general proportions of adjacent buildings and how it takes cues from materials and other physical characteristics.	No, it is hoped to be an improvement on the materials found adjacent in Park View and Chapel Lane.
If a proposal is an extension, is it subsidiary to the existing property so as not to compromise its character?	N/a
Does the proposal maintain or enhance the existing landscape features?	N/a
Has the local architectural character and precedent been demonstrated in the proposals?	No, and nor would it be desired to copy the development styles in Park View and Chapel Lane
If the proposal is a contemporary design, are the details and materials of a sufficiently high enough quality and does it relate specifically to the architectural characteristics and scale of the site?	The development is not contemporary and on that basis this point applies no further. No particular style has been indicated by the allocation itself.
What effect will services have on the scheme as a whole?	Would be considered by other authorities and service providers.
Can the effect of services be integrated at the planning design stage, or mitigated if harmful?	No obvious harm has been identified.
Has the lighting scheme been designed to avoid light pollution?	Lighting is not controlled by the outline permission or a part of the reserved matters. The houses are standard in terms of expected amount of windows and their size. Light pollution will be significant when compared to the current field, but not beyond normally expectation for the allocation and principle of a new housing estate.
Has adequate provision been made for bin storage, waste separation and relevant recycling facilities?	Yes and conditioned.
Has the location of the bin storage facilities been considered relative to	Yes and no concerns have been raised.

the travel distance from the collection vehicle?	
Has the impact of the design and location of the bin storage facilities been considered in the context of the whole development?	Yes
Could additional measures, such as landscaping be used to help integrate the bin storage facilities into the development?	No, provision is sufficient
Has any provision been made for the need to enlarge the bin storage in the future without adversely affecting the development in other ways?	No, but gardens are available and have sufficient space to allow for more bin storage if needed.
Have all aspects of security been fully considered and integrated into the design of the building and open spaces? For standalone elements (e.g. external bin areas, cycle storage, etc.) materials and treatment should be of equal quality, durability and appearance as for the main building.	All open spaces and public spaces are overlooked. Escape routes are avoided in the layout. Gardens secure. Officers are not aware of any security concerns.
The use of energy saving/efficient technologies (e.g. solar, panels, green roofs, water harvesting, waste collection, etc.), should be integrally designed to complement the building and not as bolt-ons after construction.	Not a matter for reserved matters and secured for consideration under the outline planning permission as a condition.