

## **Officer Report**

**Item No: 6A**

**Reference:** DC/21/00641

**Case Officer:** Alex Scott

**Ward:** Bacton.

**Ward Member/s:** Cllr Andrew Mellen.

---

## **RECOMMENDATION – THAT THE CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER APPROVE RESERVED MATTERS WITH CONDITIONS**

---

### **Description of Development**

Submission of Details (Reserved Matters) in relation to outline planning permission DC/18/00723. Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for the erection of up to 51 dwellings, highway improvements including widening of Turkeyhall Lane, provision of Public Open Space and associated Infrastructure.

### **Location**

Land to the east of Turkeyhall Lane, Bacton, Suffolk,

**Expiry Date:** 11/06/2021

**Application Type:** RES - Reserved Matters

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

**Applicant:** Flagship Group

**Agent:** Mr Jake Lambert

**Parish:** Bacton

**Site Area:** 3.52 ha

**Density of Development:**

Gross Density (Total Site): 14.49 dph

Net Density (Developed Site, excluding open space and SuDs): 21.34 dph (open space and SuDS measures 1.13 ha approx).

### **Details of Previous Committee / Resolutions and any member site visit:**

Outline Planning Permission ref: DC/18/00723 approved by Committee, subject to conditions, on 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2018.

This Reserved Matters Application ref: DC/21/00641 was first considered at MSDC Committee B on 9<sup>th</sup> June 2021. Members resolved to defer the application to a future committee for the following reasons:

---

---

CLASSIFICATION: Official

“Defer for design review - The proposed development represents poor design and layout, including lack of suitable surveillance of open space areas, parking of cars immediate adj of resident gardens of North Close failing provisions of GP 1.”

This Reserved Matters Application ref: DC/21/00641 was then again considered at MSDC Committee B on 4<sup>th</sup> August 2021. Members again resolved to defer the application to a future committee for the following reasons:

“Defer to consider all matters raised in debate, design, ecology with particular regard to the apartment block to the south”

**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 - Advice given on:**  
07/10/2020.

---

## **PART ONE – 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  
CS02 - Development in the Countryside & Countryside Villages  
CS03 - Reduce Contributions to Climate Change  
CS04 - Adapting to Climate Change  
CS05 - Mid Suffolk's Environment  
CS06 - Services and Infrastructure  
GP01 - Design and layout of development  
HB01 - Protection of historic buildings  
HB14 - Ensuring archaeological remains are not destroyed  
H07 - Restricting housing development unrelated to needs of countryside  
H13 - Design and layout of housing development  
H14 - A range of house types to meet different accommodation needs  
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  
RT04 - Amenity open space and play areas within residential development  
RT12 - Footpaths and Bridleways  
CL08 - Protecting wildlife habitats

## **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**

#### **Town/Parish Council (Appendix 3)**

##### **Bacton Parish Council - 16/03/2021 & 28/05/2021:**

Object: Application submitted without prior public engagement; Concern with regards safe access and suitability of existing road and junction with Pound Hill; The current proposal has compromised the available open space being offered and does not reflect what was offered at outline stage; Bacton has a serious deficit of place spaces; Question how public space maintenance vehicles will gain access; Concerns with regards the proximity of the development to the northern site boundary, and an existing property, and the resultant loss of residential amenity; Proposed footpath to north close would mean further loss of amenity for residents; Do not consider affordable housing should be clustered, in the interest of avoiding social isolation and mixed and balanced communities; Concerns with regards Traffic Management of construction vehicles.

#### **National Consultee (Appendix 4)**

##### **Natural England - 15/02/2021, 19/04/2021, 07/07/2021 & 16/11/2021:**

Natural England has no comments to make on this application.

##### **Anglian Water - 16/02/2021, 29/04/2021 & 14/07/2021:**

Having reviewed the applicant's foul drainage strategy, consider: The impact on public foul sewerage network has not been adequately addressed at this stage.

##### **Highways England - 15/02/2021, 04/05/2021, 19/06/2021 & 16/11/2021:**

Offer no objection - Highways Act Section 175B is not relevant to this application - There is unlikely to be any adverse effect upon the Strategic Road Network.

##### **Network Rail - 23/02/2021, 20/04/2021, 05/07/2021, 19/06/2021 & 16/11/2021:**

Network Rail have no objections to the proposals.

##### **NHS - Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) – 25/02/2021 & 15/07/2021**

Provision of increased capacity within existing healthcare premises to be sought by CIL contributions. Funds likely to be used to reconfigure/extend Manor Farm Branch Surgery.

## **County Council Responses (Appendix 5)**

### **SCC - Highways - Initial Comments - 24/02/2021 & 20/05/2021:**

Further information and clarification, on issues specified, required.

### **SCC - Highways - Comments following receipt of further information - 07/07/2021:**

Advise that the developer should enter into a formal Section 38 agreement with the Highway Authority relating to construction and adoption of Estate Roads - Advise soft landscaping, over 600mm high, should not be planted within road junction visibility splays.

### **SCC - Highways – Final Comments on scheme currently proposed - 29/07/2021 & 30/11/2021:**

Do not wish to restrict the grant of permission due to the application not having a detrimental effect upon the adopted highway.

### **SCC - Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) - Initial Comments - 15/02/2021, 20/04/2021 & 10/11/2021:**

Holding Objection - Actions suggested in order to overcome objections.

### **SCC - Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) - Subsequent Comments - 11/05/2021, 06/07/2021, and 16/11/2021:**

Recommend approval of this application (on basis of revised information received).

### **SCC - Archaeology - 15/02/2021, 13/04/2021 & 08/07/2021:**

Current proposal does not affect previous advice (given during consultation on the outline planning application) - We have received and approved a report of archaeological evaluation results for this development. Although archaeological remains were encountered, it is unlikely that further investigation would add significantly to this new information - We have no comments to make regarding the amended documents.

### **SCC - Travel Plan Officer - 09/02/2021, 13/04/2021, 01/07/2021 & 10/11/2021:**

No comment to make - a Travel Plan, or Travel Plan measures, were not secured as part of the original outline application.

### **SCC - Development Contributions - 10/02/2021, 04/05/2021 & 12/11/2021:**

No comments to make on this (reserved matters) application - Outline planning permission was granted under reference DC/18/00723. In respect of infrastructure, the County Council will make a future bid for CIL funds if the development is built out.

### **SCC - Fire and Rescue - 03/03/2021, 13/04/2021 & 09/11/2021:**

No objection - Subject to compliance with Condition 21 of Outline PP.

## **Internal Consultee Responses (Appendix 6)**

### **MSDC - Heritage - 05/03/2021, 23/04/2021, 02/06/2021, 05/07/2021 & 30/11/2021:**

Raise no particular concerns at this stage - Do not consider that the harm identified at Outline Stage could be fully removed through Reserved Matters. Nonetheless, the Site Layout Plan now proposed is an improvement over the last iteration of the indicative Site Layout Plans submitted at Outline Stage - Further details requested in relation to proposed foul pumping station by way of condition.

### **MSDC - Landscape Consultants - 12/03/2021, 04/05/2021, 13/07/2021 & 30/11/2021:**

The proposed landscape plan is appropriate for a development of this scale and within this location - Generally support changes made to the layout.

### **MSDC - Ecology Consultants - Initial Comments - 01/04/2021, 05/05/2021 & 19/07/2021:**

No objection raised with regards layout and landscaping proposed - Following receipt of revised details now satisfied with proposed Landscaping Schedule and Landscape Management Plan, submitted to meet the requirements of condition 28 of the outline consent.

### **MSDC - Ecology Consultants - Subsequent Comments - Following receipt of amended layout and Ecology Addendum Report - 01/12/2021:**

Following re-assessment of Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, initially provided with the application, and assessment of the further information supplied: remain satisfied with proposed landscape plan, particularly the pond planting mix; approve of proposed biodiversity enhancements; and approve the proposed wildlife sensitivity lighting strategy.

### **MSDC - Environmental Protection - Land Contamination Issues - 10/02/2021, 30/04/2021 19/07/2021 & 25/11/2021:**

No comments to make in addition to those made towards the 2018 permission.

### **MSDC - Environmental Protection - Air Quality Issues - 26/02/2021, 30/04/2021, 19/07/2021 & 25/11/2021:**

No comments to make with respect to Local Air Quality Management.

### **MSDC - Environmental Protection - Noise/Odour/Light/Smoke Issues - 17/02/2021, 5/04/2021, 07/07/2021 & 11/11/2021:**

Do not raise objection, subject to: Hours of Work; Construction Management; On-site Burning relating to construction; and Lighting design, conditions being secured by any permission granted.

### **MSDC - Environmental Protection - Sustainability - 02/03/2021, 30/04/2021, 12/07/2021 & 26/11/2021:**

This proposal does not directly deal with Sustainability/Climate Change aspects, however I have studied the applicant's documents and noticed their comments within the Planning Statement - Expect a further consultation request in relation to Condition 19 (of the outline planning permission), that formally requests a Sustainability Statement.

### **MSDC - Waste Services - 11/02/2021, 20/04/2021, 06/05/2021 & 09/07/2021:**

Waste services do not wish to add any further comments to our original (submitted during consultation on the outline planning application) - Layout should be adequate for use by RCV.

**MSDC - Public Realm - 16/02/2021, 19/04/2021, 19/07/2021 & 26/11/2021 :**

Public Realm Officers have reviewed the landscape schedule and maintenance plan and associated drawings and consider that the information provided is sufficient to discharge the outline planning condition - Support the proposed treatment of the open spaces within the development.

**MSDC - Strategic Housing - Initial Comments Received - 02/03/2021, 03/06/2021, 15/07/2021:**

The proposed housing mix for affordable and open market is acceptable and we note that bungalows are included in the mix which is welcomed - Note that the Registered Provider has agreed the current layout however we do not support this approach.- Preference is for affordable homes to be integrated into the development to create a balance of housing tenure across the site ensuring a cohesive, inclusive community and scheme.

**MSDC - Strategic Housing - Final Comments on amended design and layout - 16/12/2021:**

All affordable housing now meets Nationally Described Space Standards - Proposed Mix of Affordable Units is considered acceptable - Do not agree with applicant's interpretation of NPPF Para 65.

**MSDC - Private Sector Housing - 13/04/2021:**

Are not required to be involved or informed.

**Mid Suffolk Disability Forum - 10/02/2021, 21/04/2021, 02/07/2021 & 11/11/2021:**

It is noted that the intention is to recognise those with restricted mobility in this development and we are pleased to note the intention to provide 10 bungalows.

We would expect that all dwellings will meet Parts M4(1), M4(2), and M4(3), of building regulations.

Every effort should be made to ensure all footpaths are wide enough for wheelchair users, with a minimum width of 1500mm, and that any dropped kerbs are absolutely level with the road for ease of access.

All surfaces for footpaths should be firm, durable and level. No loose gravel, cobbles or uneven setts should be used.

**\*Suffolk Constabulary - Design Out Crime Officer - 13/08/2021:**

Concerns raised with regards: rear parking court of plots 46-51 and under-croft; lack of surveillance and lack of active windows fronting public open space.

\*NB: Members please note that Suffolk Constabulary comments are given in relation to the previous layout and design proposed (revision P19). Suffolk Constabulary have been formally consulted for comment on the current layout proposed (revision P20) but have not provided a response.

## **B: Representations**

At the time of writing this report at least 10 letters/emails/online comments have been received. It is the officer opinion that this represents 10 objections, 0 support and 0 general comment. A verbal update shall be provided as necessary.

Views are summarised below:-

- Turkeyhall Lane is too narrow to accommodate this development;
- Widening Turkeyhall Lane would destroy its existing character;
- Astonished that Turkeyhall Lane is being considered as the main access to the site;
- There is not enough room to widen Turkeyhall Lane without taking land from neighbouring properties and/or damaging neighbouring property - legal advice is being considered/taken by some;
- Residents of Turkeyhall Lane do not want the proposed footpath, it is unnecessary;
- The visibility splays at the junction of Turkeyhall Lane and Pound Hill are limited, insufficient and unsafe;
- The proposal will result in 50 to 200 more vehicle movements per day which will result in increased noise and air pollution and impact road capacity and safety;
- Concern with regards lack of sustainability initiatives proposed;
- The proposal will ruin the outlook of existing neighbouring properties;
- Concern with regards the safety of walkers, cyclists and horse riders who use Turkeyhall Lane and Clay Lane;
- Proposed open space will not benefit wider community as there is no direct access other than through the proposed estate;
- Proposed boundary treatment will affect existing residents views;
- The proposal will urbanise the rural character of the area;
- The design of dwellings proposed is not in keeping with the existing character of the locality;
- Do not consider proposed landscaping is sufficient for character of site and area and sufficient to screen the development;
- The proposed on-street visitor parking makes the street-scene very car dominated;
- Proposed substation compound is utilitarian and in an offensive position;
- Concern with regards surface water drainage and risk of flooding caused by the development;
- Do not consider existing foul drainage systems have capacity of the new development;
- Concern with regards proposal's impact on the landscape and wildlife;
- Some aspects of the proposal would negatively impact neighbouring amenity;
- Do not consider the affordable housing should be grouped together;
- Concern with regards the impact on existing road networks and highway safety during construction - note that larger vehicles are restricted by the low railway bridge on Pound Hill, forcing them to use Turkeyhall Lane and Clay Lane, which are narrow;
- The developers have not engaged with residents prior to submitting the application - do not consider Covid 19 is an excuse not to do this.

(Note: All individual representations are counted and considered. Repeated and/or additional communication from a single individual will be counted as one representation.)

## **PLANNING HISTORY**

**REF:** DC/18/00723

Outline Planning Application (Access to be considered) Erection of up to 51 new homes, highway improvements including widening of

**DECISION:** GTD  
03.07.2018

---

## **PART TWO – ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION**

---

### **1. The Site and Surroundings**

- 1.1. The application site comprises (Grade 3) agricultural land to the north of Bacton, which is designated as a Key Service Centre in the Core Strategy. The site is located between residential properties to the west (Woodward Avenue) and south (North Close), and the Diss to Ipswich railway line to the east. The site fronts Turkey Hall Lane. To the east of the site is St Mary's Close Playground. The site abuts the village settlement boundary on its southern and western sides. To the north are arable fields.
- 1.2. In respect of heritage assets, at the north western corner of the site is Turkey Hall, a Grade II listed property and its associated outbuildings and land, which wrap around this corner of the site and front onto Turkey Hall Lane. This is the nearest listed building to the site, with others located some distance away in the central body of the village.
- 1.3. The site is not in or abutting a Conservation Area (there are no Conservation Areas in the village). The site is not in an area of special character designation such as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or Special Landscape Area. Nor is the site adjoining, or in proximity to, any designated landscape areas of special significance.
- 1.4. The site measures 3.52 ha (8.7 acres). The site is located in Flood Zone 1.
- 1.5. There is an existing field access to the site from Turkey Hall Lane. There are no Public Right of Ways that traverse or run close to the site.

### **2. The Proposal**

- 2.1. The application is submitted further to outline planning permission ref: DC/18/00723, granted in July 2018, and seeks approval of reserved matters relating to the Layout, Scale, Appearance and Landscaping of 51 no. dwellings.
- 2.2. The application proposes delivery of 33 market housing units and 18 affordable housing units, as well as well as approximately 0.98 hectares of public open space (split into three parts: to the frontage of the site, either side of the access estate road, and to the centre and south-east of the site, adjacent to St. Mary's Playground). The proposal would also deliver localised upgrade and widening works to Turkeyhall Lane (already secured by way of the outline planning permission). A Foul water pumping station and enhanced landscape planting is also proposed.
- 2.3. 2 no. large surface water attenuation basins are also proposed to the north-west site boundaries, which are intended to both serve as a Sustainable Surface Water Drainage (SuDs) and amenity features.
- 2.3. The proposed net density of housing development would be 21.34 dwellings per hectare, with back to back distances of no less than 18 metres.



2.4. The proposed dwelling types are broken down as follows:

**Market Dwellings**

Two Bedroom detached Bungalows	= 7 no.
Three Bedroom detached Bungalows	= 3 no.
Two Bedroom Semi-detached Houses	= 6 no.
Three Bedroom Semi-detached Houses	= 6 no.
Three Bedroom Detached Houses	= 4 no.
Four Bedroom Detached Houses	= 7 no.
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>= 33 no.</b>

**Affordable Dwellings**

One Bedroom Apartments (Flats)	= 6 no.
Two Bedroom Semi-detached Houses	= 9 no.
Three Bedroom Semi-detached Houses	= 3 no.
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>= 18 no.</b>

2.6. The proposed dwellings would be provided in a range of types and styles. Proposed external facing material would be a mix of facing red brick (Ibstock Multi Stock), Ivory, Off White and Suffolk Pink coloured render, with timber cladding details. Roofing materials would be a mix of red Terracotta pantiles (by Wienerberger) and black concrete pantiles (by Fenland). All windows would be white UPVC, with black entrance doors.

**3. Amendments to the Proposal since previous Committee**

3.1. The current application was previously considered by Members at the MSDC-Development Committee B meeting of the 4<sup>th</sup> August 2021. At that committee Members resolved to defer the application for the following reasons:

“Defer to consider all matters raised in debate, design, ecology with particular regard to the apartment block to the south”

3.2. In order to address the previous concerns of members the applicant has revised the proposed layout, scale and appearance of dwellings as follows:

3.3. In order to address the issue of surveillance of open space areas, the proposed open space to the centre/east of the site has been extensively re-designed, with 6 no. dwellings now directly fronting this space, to the north, and active windows from 4 no. other dwellings also fronting this space from the north and the south. Your officers consider that the proposed re-design of this area and the additional active windows fronting this area would provide adequate surveillance, overcoming the concerns previously raised by members and the Suffolk Constabulary.

3.4. The apartment block to the south of the site, previously proposed, along with its rear parking court and under-croft, has been removed from the scheme and the area it previously occupied has been replaced by 2 no. re-located private market, detached, dwellings.

3.5. The single bedroom apartment block building has been re-designed and re-located to the far north-east corner of the site, along with 2 no. semi-detached affordable dwellings, addressing previous concerns raised with regards grouping of affordable dwellings in a single area of the site. The two-bedroom affordable apartment building previously proposed has also been removed from the scheme, with the two-bedroom affordable units now proposed to be provided in the form of semi-detached or terraced dwellings.

- 3.6. With regards matters relating to Ecology, the applicant has submitted a revised Ecology addendum report following the previous committee meeting, which has been assessed by the Council's Ecology Consultants at Place Services, and who are satisfied with the assessments and proposals therein.
- 3.7. 7 no. additional allocated parking spaces are also proposed by way of the current revised layout proposed.

#### **4. The Principle of Development**

- 4.1. Whilst it is acknowledged that the site does lie outside of the current development plan settlement boundary, the principle of the proposed development has already been established by way of Outline Planning Permission Ref: DC/18/00723. Matters relating to the provision of a new site access and works to Turkeyhall lane have also been previously addressed as part of the outline planning permission, subject to conditions.
- 4.2. Objections and comments received, with regards in principle and site access issues are noted, however, such matters have previously been addressed by way of the outline permission granted, with any further details required being subject to conditions of that outline planning permission.
- 4.2. The current application relates specifically to issues of Layout, Scale, Appearance and Landscaping of the site only.

#### **5. Site Access, Parking and Highway Safety Considerations**

- 5.1. The point of access and off-site highways works have previously been dealt with under the outline permission. The outline permission also establishes the principle of up to 51 dwellings and related traffic to and from the site. However, layout of parking and visitor parking is for considerations and meets the requirements under the SCC Parking Standards. The parking proposals are as follows: -
  - 114 no. allocated parking spaces (including Garages) (Equates to 2.24 parking spaces per dwelling)
  - 14 no. Visitor/Informal off road parking bays (Equates to 0.28 spaces per dwelling).
- 5.2. Electric Car Charging Points are also proposed within each garage proposed.
- 5.3. Parking provision is considered to meet the minimum requirement for parking places as shown in the Suffolk Parking for Guidance 2019.
- 5.4. In conclusion, the provision of 51 dwellings and the access point have been agreed under the outline permission. Detailed road alignment in addition to the level and location of all parking is acceptable in policy terms. Your officers consider the changes during the course of the application have now created a spacious layout with access to public open space, and village services, with safe pedestrian routes. It is considered that the applicant has addressed all concerns by making important and substantial changes to the layout with a complete review of the site. It is considered that the latest scheme before you are the result of beneficial amendments and improvements to the proposal to that originally submitted.
- 5.4. The Local Highway Authority has been consulted on the latest proposal and is satisfied with the proposed layout with, with regards the proposed estate roads and turning and parking proposed.

SCC-Highways consider the layout currently proposed would not result in a detrimental effect upon the existing adopted highway and do not wish to restrict the granting of reserved matters.

#### Off Site Highways Works

- 5.5. Matters relating to off site works to Turkeyhall Lane have previously been considered and agreed, in principle, as part of outline planning permission ref: DC/18/00723, with technical details and delivery secured by way of condition attached to that permission.
- 5.6. The applicant has been in discussion with the Parish Council and District and County Council Ward Members regarding this specific issue, with concerns regarding lack of provision for pedestrians along Turkey Hall Lane being highlighted.
- 5.7. There are site constraints that may preclude a pedestrian footway being provided from the site, south to Pound Hill, via either Turkeyhall Lane or North Close, should road widening to TurkeyHall Lane proceed, as originally proposed and agreed.
- 5.8. The latest proposal being considered to address the issue is to retain the carriageway width of Turkeyhall Lane as existing through to north of the development site access (approximately 4.1m width), with the addition of a siding footway of 1.2m width (in the main, excluding pinch-points), with a 50mm kerb upstand, designed as over-runnable, so that where vehicles need to pass, this would be possible. A wider footway and dedicated passing places, incorporating double yellow lines to deter parking, would be provided where practicable. Making the relevant section of Turkeyhall Lane a 20mph speed limit has also been proposed. It is understood that safety auditors have assessed the principle of this proposal and consider this to be a reasonable alternative to address concerns regarding provision for pedestrians. It is also understood that Highways engineers at Suffolk County Council have also considered the proposal and have informally agreed to the principle of this solution, subject to: passing places being delivered where possible; pedestrians having right of way in relevant locations; a priority system for vehicles heading in one direction; and provision of advance signage.
- 5.9. Members will please note that this matter relates to the Outline Planning Permission and condition applied to thereof, and will be controlled on that basis. This matter does not, however, affect determination of the current reserved matters application.

#### **6. Design and Layout [Impact on Street Scene]**

- 6.1. The development is predominantly two-storey, however the developer has sought to provide 10 no. Bungalows as part of the development.
- 6.2. The proposed layout has been designed so as to set the development back from Turkeyhall Lane and has introduced 2 no. areas of public open space to the frontage of the development, either side of the proposed estate access road. The development is proposed with a central estate spine road running south-west to north-east through the development, with two branch roads. Paved footpaths are also proposed adjacent to the principle estate roads providing safe pedestrian routes through the development, avoiding linking to highways with no existing footways as much as possible, linking the site to the existing adjacent St. Mary's Playground. The proposed layout is considered to create a welcoming, quality, pedestrian-friendly residential

environment. Back gardens meet back gardens or the landscaped boundaries of the site, and avoid unsupervised spaces. The proposed open spaces and landscaped boundaries provide green corridors to accord with landscaping recommendations, as well as creating a softer buffer to the adjoining countryside. Discussions with the developer since the application was originally submitted has led to a number of improvements to the connections across and around the site, and on-site public open space provision, that taken together have resulted in attractive spaces between dwellings to encourage activity and good sense of place, with direct links to the open countryside.

- 6.3. The proposed housing density of 21.34 dwellings per hectare, although lower than the 40 dph as set out in development plan policy CS9, is considered to be acceptable in this location, at the rural edge of the village, adjacent to less dense edge of settlement properties. The proposed density, is therefore considered to be appropriate to the existing character and density of development to its immediate surrounds, and appropriate to the landscape character of the locality.
- 6.4. The layout proposes a wide range of house types, with 12 total design variations proposed. The resulting range of house types enjoy detailed features with a greater range of character variances when compared to an average estate of a similar scale. It is considered that the proposals will provide a development of sufficient interest and individual character, suitable in the proposed location. The scheme delivers a range of housing types which would provide a suitable mix address and would deliver 18 no. affordable housing units.
- 6.5. Your Strategic Housing Officers have assessed the application proposal and are satisfied that the proposed would deliver affordable dwellings of a type and tenure that is acceptable, in accordance with what was previously agreed in principle at outline stage, also being compliant in relation to Nationally Described Space Standards.

## **7. Landscape Impact, Trees, Ecology, Biodiversity and Protected Species**

- 7.1. The proposed scheme of landscaping, providing strong landscape and open space buffering, incorporating appropriate tree, hedge and plant species, to the north and east countryside boundaries, is considered appropriate to the type and scale of development proposed. The proposed scheme of landscaping is also considered to provide green corridors traversing the countryside edges of the site, to the benefit of ecological species.
- 7.2. Council landscape consultants have been consulted on the application proposal and, are satisfied with the level of detail provided with regards hard and soft landscaping.
- 7.3. Overall the proposed scheme of landscaping is considered to screen and soften the proposed development into the existing landscape, to create an appropriate soft edge to the village in this location, and to provide suitable opportunities for ecological species.

## **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. The addition of a knee high post and rail fence adjacent to existing dwellings at North Close is considered to adequately preserve outlook amenity, onto the new open space areas proposed. In addition, the removal of the apartment building and rear parking court previously proposed, adjacent to North Close, ensure the amenities of these neighbouring properties are not significantly compromised by way of the development.
- 8.5. The proposal, therefore, accords with the aspirations of development plan policies H13 and H16 and with paragraph 130 of the NPPF in this regard.

### **9.1. Surface Water Drainage and Flood Risk**

- 9.1. The applicant has produced a site specific Flood Risk Assessment / Surface Water Drainage Strategy, carried out by a suitably qualified Company (Richard Jackson Engineering Consultants), submitted with the application, and amended subsequently, following advice given by the Lead Local Flood Authority at Suffolk County Council.
- 9.2. The report is considered to satisfactorily demonstrate that the proposed development is at 'low' risk of flooding from all sources.
- 9.3. The proposed surface water drainage strategy submitted is based on attenuation storage, with controlled discharge to the existing drainage ditch which runs through the site, and the proposed layout incorporates 2 no. attenuation storage basins to the north-west boundaries of the site, that form an integral part of the development scheme and the surface water drainage strategy for the site.
- 9.4. The NPPF requires that, for major applications such as this, sustainable drainage systems for the management of run-off are put in place, unless demonstrated to be inappropriate. Sustainable drainage is an approach to managing surface water run-off which seeks to mimic natural drainage systems and retain water on or near the site, as opposed to traditional drainage approaches, involving piping water off-site as quickly as possible. SuDS involve a range of techniques including soakaways, infiltration trenches, permeable surfaces, grassed swales, ponds and wetlands. SuDS offer significant advantages over conventional pipe drainage systems in reducing flood risk by attenuating the rate and quality of surface water run-off from a site, promoting groundwater recharge and improving water quality amenity.
- 9.5. National Planning Practice Guidance directs what sort of SuDS should be considered. Generally, the aim should be to discharge surface water run-off as high up the below hierarchy of options as reasonably practicable:
- 1) Into the ground (infiltration);
  - 2) To a surface water body;
  - 3) To a surface water sewer, highway drain or another drainage system;
  - 4) To a combined sewer.
- 9.6. The NPPG provides that the particular types of SuDS may not be practicable in all locations.

- 9.7. In addition to the above, the NPPF also requires that developments do not increase flood risk elsewhere.
- 9.8. 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.
- 9.9. In assessing the proposal, your officers consider the surface water drainage scheme, as currently proposed would suitably manage surface water runoff from the proposed development and would not demonstrably result in significant increased flood risk on the site or elsewhere.

## **10. Parish Council Comments**

- 10.1. The majority of matters raised by Bacton Parish Council have been considered in the above report, but the following issues have also been raised:
- The applicant' did not engage with the public prior to submitting the application; and
  - The current proposal has compromised the available open space being offered, and public open space need in the Village.
- 10.2. Whilst paragraphs 39 to 46 of the NPPF encourage pre-application engagement with communities, this is not a specific policy requirement or obligation on the part of the applicant. It is also understood that the applicant has engaged with the Parish Council, since the application was last at committee, in relation to the current layout and design now proposed.
- 10.3. The proposal would provide approximately 1 hectare of public open space available to both existing and future residents. Such provision is considered more than adequate for a development of this scale.

---

## **PART THREE – CONCLUSION**

---

### **11. Planning Balance and Conclusion**

- 11.1. The principle of development has been agreed for the number of dwellings proposed as well as the access arrangements and off-site highway works. The resultant development provides an environment that is not considered to be excessively car dominated, has good supervision and details a variety of dwelling styles and materials that provides interest to a range of streetscapes. All statutory consultees offer no significant objection to the scheme that cannot be addressed by way of existing or further conditions. The proposals are well connected to the existing village and its range of services and facilities, which it would help support. The proposal will create a new landscaped edge to the village and provide green public open space assets for the community to benefit from. Overall the development is considered to provide an attractive place with a range of house types to meet both affordable and housing needs at all levels.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

**That the Chief Planning Officer APPROVE Reserved Matters, subject to conditions as summarised below and those as may be deemed necessary by the Chief Planning Officer:**

Conditions recommended to be applied to any reserved matters approval issued are as follows:

- Approved Plans and Documents;
- Those required by MSDC Heritage Officers;
- Those required by MSDC Environmental Protection Officers.

(Please see appended decision notice for those already imposed as part of Outline Planning Permission Ref: DC/18/00723).