

Committee Report

Item No: 8A

Reference: DC/21/00609

Case Officer: Daniel Cameron

Ward: Eye.

Ward Member/s: Cllr Peter Gould.

RECOMMENDATION – APPROVE RESERVED MATTERS WITH CONDITIONS

Description of Development

Submission of details (Reserved Matters in Part-Phase 1) for Outline Planning Permission 3563/15 - Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for 138 dwellings, including affordable housing, car parking, open space provision and associated infrastructure.

Location

Land To The South Of Eye Airfield, And North Of Castleton Way, Eye

Expiry Date: 26/01/2022

Application Type: RES - Reserved Matters

Development Type: Major Small Scale - Dwellings

Applicant: Persimmon Homes Suffolk

Agent: Pegasus Design

Parish: Eye

Site Area: 4.65ha

Density of Development: 30 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 (Appendix 1): No

Has the application been subject to Pre-Application Advice: Yes, discussions were held between the Local Planning Authority Officers and the Developer with regards to bringing forward the site and to provide an update on conditions attached to the outline.

PART ONE – REASON FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE

The application is referred to committee for the following reason:

The development is a major development of 15 or more residential dwellings and is required to be considered by Development Control Committee under the Scheme of Delegation.

CLASSIFICATION: Official

PART TWO – POLICIES AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Summary of Policies

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework
NPPG - National Planning Practice Guidance

FC1 - Presumption In Favour Of Sustainable Development
FC1.1 - Mid Suffolk Approach To Delivering Sustainable Development
FC2 - Provision And Distribution Of Housing

CS1 Settlement Hierarchy
CS2 Development in the Countryside & Countryside Villages
CS3 Reduce Contributions to Climate Change
CS4 Adapting to Climate Change
CS5 Mid Suffolk's Environment
CS6 Services and Infrastructure
CS9 Density and Mix

SB2 Development appropriate to its setting
GP1 Design and layout of development
H7 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
CL8 Protecting wildlife habitats
T4 Planning Obligations and highway infrastructure
T9 Parking Standards
T10 Highway considerations in development
T11 Facilities for pedestrians and cyclists
T12 Designing for people with disabilities
RT12 Footpaths and bridleways
HB1 Protection of Listed Buildings
HB14 Archaeology

Neighbourhood Plan Status and Policies

The Eye Neighbourhood Plan is a made neighbourhood plan and forms part of the adopted development plan. In particular, attention is drawn to the following policies:

Eye 3 – House Types and Sizes
Eye 4 – Land South of Eye Airfield
Eye 16 – Development within the Settlement Boundary
Eye 24 – Improvement of Public Rights of Way
Eye 25 – Electric Vehicle Charging in Development
Eye 28 – Infrastructure

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 Council (Appendix 3)

Initial Eye Town Council – Comments received 25th March 2021

Eye Town Council (ETC) objects to this application.

The Planning Committee has considered the application, after a delegation to do so from full council at its meeting on February 17th 2021, and offers the following reasons and explainers for its objection:

1. Introduction

1.1. The Eye Neighbourhood Plan (ENP) will be put to a referendum of the people of Eye in May 2021. This is the culmination of almost 4 years of public consultation and the referendum version of the ENP has been unanimously adopted by ETC. The ENP was given significant weight by the Inspector in the recent appeal (APP/W3520/W/18/3215534) in Eye for the Housing development on the Tuffs Rd/Maple Way site. It is therefore acknowledged as a significant material consideration in planning decisions and, subject to the referendum outcome, will be part of the Development Plan by the time this Planning Application is determined.

1.2. Taken together with the emerging JLP (which supports the policies of the ENP), the ENP should provide the framework for ETCs comments as well as the basis for MSDCs decision on the application. ETC will support applications which comply with the ENPs policies and work with developers who share the ENPs community vision. For the reasons stated below this application does not conform to the ENP and it should be refused in accordance with para 12 of the NPPF: Where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan (including any neighbourhood plans that form part of the development plan), permission should not usually be granted.

1.3. The primary driver for the objection is what ETC considers a clear aim from the applicant to exceed, by a distance, the number of homes in the Outline Planning Permission (OPP) for the relevant part of the OPP area under consideration in this application. This is evidenced in the Design, Access and Planning Compliance Statement (DAS) where on page 5 the total of up to 280 homes (citing the OPP reference 3653/15) on the whole site is correctly cited but this up to is omitted from the description of the development on page 2 seeking, in ETCs opinion, to seek to remove the OPPs cap for homes on the site. This is explained in more detail in section 2.

1.4. The DAS refers to only one policy in the ENP which is Policy Eye 4. Policies Eye 1 (Housing Allocations), Eye 2 (Form of Affordable Housing Provision), Eye 3 (House Types and Size), Eye 16, Eye 22 and Eye 25 are relevant and have not been addressed. Again this is referred to in more detail in section 2. The DAS is deficient and should be revised and resubmitted demonstrating how it complies with each of these policies.

2. Specific ENP policy compliance

2.1. The area covered by this application is not the whole area relevant to the up to 280 homes in the OPP. This figure is repeated ENP Policy Eye 1 and ENP Policy Eye 4. The Phasing Plan on drawing LV101-P-103 covers Parcels 13 and 14 from the Eye Airfield Development Plan which should total a maximum of 240 homes from the Indicative Master Plan (IMP) incorporated as Figure 2 in the ENP. This application covers around 40% of this area (subject to survey) and seeks permission for 138 homes.

2.2. This means that a second phase would either contain just 102 homes on the balance 60% of the area which is unlikely. Clues to the intention for the rest of Packages 13 and 14 can be found from sheets 3 and 4 of the drainage drawings prepared by Wormald Burrows (E3803/502) which when added together total 372 comprising 138 for Phase 1 and a further 234 on Phase 2. This constitutes over development and is contrary to Policy Eye 1, Eye 4 and the OPP.

2.3 No mention is made in the DAS of any contribution towards the 18 homes at less than 80% of market rent in Policy Eye 2. This could be corrected in a subsequent phase but at present the application is contrary to Policy Eye 2.

2.4. Policy Eye 3 states that 53% of new homes should be 1-2 bedrooms, 41% 3 bedrooms and 5% 4 or more bedrooms. This is based on the ENPs housing needs survey and admittedly this is a figure for the total number of homes in the ENP. The figures in the 138 homes are 24% 1-2 bedroom, 48% 3 bedroom and 28% 4 or more bedrooms. This would tilt the dwelling mix too far in favour of large homes making it difficult to balance the smaller homes in subsequent applications. The dwelling mix is therefore contrary to Policy Eye 3.

2.5. Policy Eye 16 requires that proposals should take account of the Eye Neighbourhood Masterplanning and Design Guidelines 2019. The DAS makes no reference to these and is therefore contrary to Policy Eye 16. Comments from members of the ETC Planning Committee about the quality of the detail of some of the design solutions are offered in more detail in section 3.

2.6. There are no proposals for EV charging. Policy Eye 25 requires all new development to have one EV charging point per dwelling with off road parking and 10% of the number of spaces for vehicles using communal parking. The application is therefore contrary to Policy Eye 25.

3. Design Quality

3.1 Policy Eye 4 requires the development to be in accordance with the Design Brief and Policy Eye 16 requires proposals to take account of the Eye neighbourhood Masterplanning and Design Guidelines 2019. The application fails to meet the standards required by these and is therefore contrary to the development plan.

3.2 ETC acknowledges that the outline of the IMP is still visible in the application with open spaces largely intact. The problem is that the areas shown for dwellings are packed at a density over 50% greater than numbers in the IMP if ETCs calculations are correct for intended numbers. ETC recognises that this is an indicative plan leaving scope for design flair in terms of, for example, layout and connectivity but numbers have been grossly exceeded.

3.3. The desire to maximise numbers is a cause of poor design throughout the scheme. The finished product will feel overdeveloped and provide a poor quality of living environment for a number of reasons including:

- a. The size of gardens is very small as a direct result of the high density. Apart from an impact on personal leisure space this decreases opportunities to build home-offices where needed and so aid flexible working.
- b. Parking provision is poor. There are still areas of triple parking which are unlikely to be used in practice and communal area parking would be unnecessary at a lower site density. ETCs view is that communal parking is not desirable as it is less secure, needs to be well lit, will incur maintenance costs and can act as a magnet for anti-social behaviour.
- c. ETC notes that the Design Guide supports a varied roof line but as used here offering three storey homes in terraces of 4 decreases on-plot parking and is clearly driven by the desire to minimise the ground floor footprint. This is more suited to an urban environment. Three or 2.5 storey homes are acceptable and there are good examples in Eye but, at their best, as detached dwellings.
- d. Visitor parking is poorly accommodated. ETCs view is that parking will quickly colonise visitor parking areas anyway and also spill out on to the road spaces offering a cluttered built environment.
- e. There are plots overlooking car parking areas mainly as a result of higher density. It is not clear from the plans if these are the affordable proportion in all cases but if so this is a less favourable outlook to homes for sale and should be revised.

3.4. There are also concerns about the design of the specific house types:

- a. There is little space allocated for home working within the layout other than a fifth bedroom in two of the types which is presumably not big enough to be called a bedroom.
- b. Porches, according to the Design Code, are not desirable and are therefore contrary to Policy Eye 16. The porch design offered lacks variety between types and basically looks planted-on.
- c. Three dwelling types have an entry area sliced from the lounge to form a poor entrance lobby and reduced useable living space.
- d. Some verges are formed with just an overhanging roof tile. ETC considers that purpose built verges are preferable.
- d. Soil and vent pipe stacks are shown externally for some house types which is unacceptable.

3.5 Connectivity should be addressed at this stage so as to seek to integrate the development into the local Eye economy and encourage walking and cycling. This is mentioned in the ENP in policy 22 and any application on the airfield should show a link up with paths to the airfield and town centre. This is not addressed in the application.

3.6. Landscaping should also be addressed now. There are two areas of critical importance: the Greenway at the north of the site described in the IMP as Langton Grove Greenway is not addressed and the raised plateau nature of the site makes the landscaping at the sites western boundary also critical both in terms of screening and the first view driving into town along Castleton Way.

4. Local issues raised

4.1. Surface water drainage has been raised by both councillors and members of the public as a matter of concern. There has been an historic problem with surface water run-off in Gaye Crescent and surface water drains in Victoria Hill regularly overflow. This is not specifically a comment on this application but a note to MSDC in the evaluation of any application on this site to have SuDS calculations independently checked.

5. ETC engagement

5.1 ETC has engaged positively with the progress of this development and the applicant has received consistent advice about what is needed for the proposal to comply with relevant policies. It is therefore disappointing that the current application fails to comply with these policies in so many areas. A number of matters noted in the Pre-Application meeting and the meeting with the applicant, MSDC and ETC in February 2021 are likewise not fully addressed. The application deviates from or leaves several areas from relevant documents such as the Design Brief in a similar state.

5.2. A summary of these has been prepared and it is attached as Appendix A. There is a good deal of overlap between this and matters highlighted in this objection but ETC hopes that this list will serve as the basis for an agenda for a future discussion on how this site can be developed in a manner shaped by the community.

DC/00609/21 Appendix A

Summary of common issues raised with Persimmon:

1. The Eye Neighbourhood Plan holds considerable weight and encouragement to adhere to the policies within it see para 8 of pre-Application discussion notes
2. Policy Eye 4 requires the development to accord with the Approved Design brief taken to be a suite of documents approved by MSDC. Conflict with these would equate to conflict with the development plan (once the ENP is made). A key test of the application is how it has engaged with and adhered to these documents. A compliance statement is strongly recommended Paras 9 – 14 of the pre-Application discussion notes and para 2 of the notes for the meeting 22nd February.
3. Compliance with outline planning permission required see pre-Application notes para 5 and note (2) of meeting held 22nd February.
4. The ENP sets out an expectation of housing mix para 29 of pre-Application discussion notes and note (3) of meeting 22nd February.

5. Need for current application site to be set in the context of the development of the site as a whole and preferably within an overall masterplan para 6 of pre-Application discussion notes and note (2) of meeting 22nd February.
6. Condition 12 requires an energy strategy which should support the application and EV charging and broadband should be considered in detail Para 31 of pre-Application discussion notes and need to comply with ENP 27 EV charging note 6 of meeting 22nd February.
7. The need for an overarching landscape strategy para 6 of pre-Application discussion notes.
8. Triple parking should be avoided para 16 of pre-Application discussion notes.
9. Affordable housing faces onto parking areas which is not consistent with a tenure blind ethos para 18 of pre-Application discussion notes.
10. The design does not facilitate a perimeter means of circulation para 19 pre-Application discussion notes
11. Opportunities for public art should be explored with ETC para 24 of pre-Application discussion notes.
12. Design includes a significant amount of regimentation and uniformity para 26 of pre-Application discussion notes.
13. Consideration should be given to the connection of the site allocated in ENP Policy Eye 7 and 8 para 32 and 33 of the pre-Application discussion notes.
14. ENP Policy Eye 2 requires some affordable housing to be provided at less than 80% of market rents
15. Pedestrian crossing of Castleton way should be reconsidered to be closer to the footpath between the development leading to the Town centre
16. The development should be connected to the new right of way to the west of the Town para 5 of the pre-Application discussion notes and note (1) meeting notes 22nd February.

Further Eye Town Council – Comments received 24th November 2021

Eye Town Council agrees that no objection is made to the Reserved Matters application for the first phase of the development of land South of Eye Airfield for the reasons stated in the report prepared by the Project Co-ordinator, but that the District Council be informed of the following concerns and, where relevant, works with the Town Council on implementation/improvements:

1. The dwelling mix is not near the mix listed in Policy Eye 3 of the Eye Neighbourhood Plan. This should be rebalanced as far as possible in a future phase. It is imperative that overall site numbers are restricted to a maximum of 265.
2. That the sustainability and biodiversity of the scheme should be enhanced and that a proposal for this to be put to MSDC should be delegated to the chair of planning with Cllr Henderson leading.
3. That MSDC undertake a thorough and independent check of the drainage calculations for both foul and surface water discharge.
4. That progress on the detailed design of the housing types be undertaken with input, where relevant, from ETC to support item 2 above.
5. That the Healing Wood Project under the direction of Cllr Henderson be considered key to the connectivity between the development and the town and that MSDC be requested to contribute to funding for this important scheme via District Councillor Peter Gould.

Project Co-Ordinator Report:

1. It is recommended that no objection is made to the Reserved Matters proposed for the first phase of the development of land South of Eye Airfield but that the District Council be informed that the Town Council is concerned that the dwelling sizes proposed for this phase do not conform to the mix required by Policy Eye 3 of the Eye Neighbourhood Plan. If this is accepted for Phase 1, the proposals for Phase 2 should seek to rebalance the overall provision on the site by providing more 2/3- bedroom homes.

Background

2. Outline planning permission was granted for 280 homes South of Eye Airfield in March 2018

(Application No 3563/15). The site is split into two with 15 dwellings and an elderly-persons home having an access from Victoria Hill while the remaining 265 homes have an access from Castleton Way. This proposal concerns Phase 1 of the 265 home part of the site.

3. In granting Outline permission with a Section 106 agreement certain matters were 'Reserved' for subsequent approval including detailed design and layout. This means that some issues such as the number of affordable homes, road layouts and contributions to infrastructure improvements are already approved and are fixed.

4. The Town Council has previously objected to the Reserved Matters proposals (Planning Committee 15th February 2021) for the following reasons:

Conflict with several policies in the ENP and the Indicative Master Plan.

Numbers of homes planned for the overall site versus those on the Indicative Master Plan. This would exceed the OPP by a large margin if approved for both phases.

The site density, small garden size and use of communal parking areas.

Dwelling sizes not matching the ENP preferred dwelling mix.

The overall design quality not meeting the requirements of the Design Guide.

5. A number of meetings have been held since then which have resulted in significant improvements to the Reserved Matters proposals.

The Eye Neighbourhood Plan

6. The Reserved Matters proposals have to be considered against the policies of the Development Plan made up of the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan. The District Council will consider the Local Plan policies, this report focuses on the Eye Neighbourhood Plan (ENP).

7. The most relevant policies of the ENP are:

Policy Eye 4 (PE4) - requires 280 dwellings to be developed on the (whole) site and that development should be in accord with the Design Brief.

PE3 - requires 53% of new homes to be 1 or 2 bedroom, 41% 3 bedroom and 5% 4 or more bedroom and 29% bungalows and 14% flats.

PE16 - requires development to take account of the Eye Neighbourhood Masterplanning and Design Guideline 2019, the use of high-quality materials and traditional features and that it demonstrates a clear understanding of the rural context of Eye with appropriate landscaping, boundary and screening planting.

PE 25 - requires all dwellings with off road parking to have EV charging available.

The Reserved Matters proposals

8. The key document is the Design and Access Strategy which can be viewed at DC_21_00609-REVISED_DESIGN_STATEMENT-7860096.pdf (baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk).

9. The proposal is for 138 homes on 4.65 hectares at 30 dwellings per hectare. It shows: The location of 28 affordable homes; 12 for rent, 9 shared ownership and 7 discounted market value.

The layout of substantial areas of open space which accord to the Design Brief.

The street hierarchy/materials including shared space.

Pedestrian and cycle routes within the development and links with routes adjoining the development.

Garage and outside parking spaces.

EV charging access points.

Street scenes and wall/roof finish materials.

Landscape strategy.

Drainage strategy.

Revisions to the proposals

10. The main improvements since the original proposals were published in February 2021 include: The application is for 138 dwellings and covers over half of the site. There is therefore some confidence that the total number of dwellings will be within the 265 provided for on this part of the

site in the Neighbourhood Plan and the Outline permission.

The size of homes is now closer to the mix required in PE3 (but still contains too many 4+ bedroom homes and too few 2/3-bedroom homes and not enough bungalows and flats).

The layout has improved with more garden space and the key open space proposed in the Design Guidelines retained.

Cycle connectivity has been improved with a segregated link from the Castleton Road junction to Victoria Mill.

Design is improved particularly the areas closest to the Castleton Way entrance to the site.

Parking arrangements have been improved with triple parking removed.

Outstanding Issues

Design

11. While significant improvements have been made, the revised proposals are still somewhat short of the standards envisaged in the site-specific Design Guide and the Eye Neighbourhood Plan Design Guidance. In particular, standard house types are overused, there is insufficient variation in materials and building heights and some detailing such as the overuse of porches is disappointing.

12. These limitations may not be sufficient to justify the Reserved Matters proposals not being approved.

House types and sizes

13. Meeting local housing needs was an important reason for local people to support the provision of new housing in the ENP. This led to a Local Housing Needs Assessment being prepared and to the requirements for smaller homes rather than larger ones and significant proportions of bungalows and flats being required by PE3.

14. Persimmon argue that the changes in working habits brought about by COVID justify more 3 bedroom and fewer 2-bedroom homes. While this is likely to be true, the provision of fewer 2-bedroom homes will reduce the number of local people that will be able to access to market housing. This is especially important as the site provides for only 20% affordable homes substantially less than the 35% target required in the emerging Local Plan.

15. The comparison of the Reserve Matters proposals and the ENP requirements is as follows:

Bedrooms Reserve Matters Proposals % ENP %

2 bedroom 19 53

3 bedroom 51 41

4+ bedrooms 30 5

House types

Houses 82 48

Bungalows 18 29

Flats 0 14

16. The likely effect of this distribution of types and sizes is that the development will serve the needs of fewer local people and attract more people into the area from outside.¹

17. The District Councils Housing Strategy response includes the comment that:

'Please can you ensure that Phase 2 only has 2 bedroom starter homes on site. As you can see from our earlier responses the need in our districts is predominately for 1 and 2 bedroom homes and not 3 or 4 bedroom.'

18. If this mix of house types and sizes is to be accepted then a similar comment should be made - that the 127 dwellings on phase 2 of the site should rebalance the contribution made by the site to meeting local housing needs.

Sustainable Development

19. The proposals do not meet high sustainable development standards, for example, high standards of insulation. It is understood that higher standards are likely to be required by

Government in the next few years and that volume housebuilders such as Persimmon have promised to be ready to implement them then. Given Phase 2 is some years away those proposals should meet the latest higher sustainable development standards.

Drainage

20. Surface water drainage has been raised by both councillors and members of the public as a matter of concern. There has been an historic problem with surface water run-off in Gaye Crescent and surface water drains in Victoria Hill regularly overflow. This is not specifically a comment on this application but a note to MSDC in the evaluation of any application on this site to have SuDS calculations independently checked.

National Consultee (Appendix 4)

Anglian Water – Comments received 25th February 2021

Foul Water

We have reviewed the applicant's submitted foul drainage strategy and flood risk documentation and consider that the impacts on the public foul sewerage network are acceptable to Anglian Water at this stage. We request that we are consulted on any forthcoming application to discharge Condition 17 of the outline planning application 3563/15, to which this Reserved Matters application relates, that require the submission and approval of detailed foul drainage information.

Surface Water

We note the applicant states the SuDS scheme may / will be adopted by Anglian Water. As yet the applicant has not engaged with us, therefore we cannot comment, at this stage, on the proposals suitability. Anglian Water encourage the use of SuDS and if the developer wishes us to be the adopting body for all or part of the proposed SuDS scheme the Design and Construction Guidance must be followed. We would recommend the applicant contact us at the earliest opportunity to discuss their SuDS design via a Pre-Planning Strategic Enquiry, please contact planningliaison@anglianwater.co.uk We request that we are consulted on any forthcoming application to discharge Condition 18 of the outline planning application 3563/15, to which this Reserved Matters application relates, that require the submission and approval of detailed surface water drainage information.

Environment Agency – Comments received 19th April 2021

Thank you for your consultation dated 10 February 2021. Please accept our apologies for the delay in providing this response. We have reviewed the application as submitted and have no objections. We are including advisory comments on Groundwater and Contaminated Land as well as on Water Resources below.

Groundwater and Contaminated Land

We have reviewed the Peter Brett Phase 2 Ground Investigation Report, July 2018, the Wormald Burrows Partnership Ltd Drainage Strategy, November 2020 and associated plans. Based on the information provided, we recommend the following informative is attached to any planning permission granted. We note infiltration drainage is not proposed at the site. Therefore, we have no further comments in relation to surface water drainage.

Advice to Applicant / LPA

If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted a remediation strategy to the local planning authority detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with and obtained written approval from the local planning authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

We recommend that developers should:

- 1) Refer to our 'Groundwater Protection' website;
- 2) Refer to our CL:AIRE Water and Land Library (WALL) and the CLR11 risk management framework provided in <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/land-contamination-how-to-manage-the-risks> when dealing with land affected by contamination, and also includes the Guiding Principles for Land Contamination for the type of information that we require in order to assess risks to controlled waters from the site. The Local Authority can advise on risk to other receptors, for example human health;
- 3) Refer to our Land Contamination Technical Guidance;
- 4) Refer to 'Position Statement on the Definition of Waste: Development Industry Code of Practice';
- 5) Refer to British Standards BS 5930:1999 A2:2010 *Code of practice for site investigations* and BS10175:2011 A1: 2013 *Investigation of potentially contaminated sites – code of practice*
- 6) Refer to our 'Piling and Penetrative Ground Improvement Methods on Land Affected by Contamination' National Groundwater & Contaminated Land Centre Project NC/99/73. The selected method, including environmental mitigation measures, should be presented in a 'Foundation Works Risk Assessment Report', guidance on producing this can be found in Table 3 of 'Piling Into Contaminated Sites';
- 7) Refer to our 'Good Practice for Decommissioning Boreholes and Wells'.
- 8) Refer to our 'Dewatering building sites and other excavations: environmental permits' guidance when temporary dewatering is proposed.

Water Resources

This development is within the Hartismere Water Resource Zone. All the water supplied within the Hartismere WRZ is sourced from groundwater abstracted from Chalk and Crag boreholes.

The WFD groundwater body from which these abstractions come from is Broadland Rivers Chalk and Crag groundwater body (GB40501G400300). This WFD groundwater is failing the Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTE) test. These are wetlands that depend on groundwater flows and/or chemical inputs to maintain them in favourable ecological condition. Any wetland that is significantly damaged by abstraction pressure will cause the whole associated groundwater body to be at Poor status. All these GW abstractions in the Hartismere WRZ can also affect baseflow to rivers especially within the Waveney catchment. More information on WFD status in the Waveney catchment can be found here: <http://environment.data.gov.uk/catchment-planning/OperationalCatchment/3518>

Under the WFD, we need to ensure that our licensing decisions do not cause water bodies to deteriorate and are consistent with enabling water bodies to meet their objectives set out in the River Basin Management Plans. We would be in breach of our duties under the WFD Regulations for us to grant a licence that did not meet those requirements.

ESW are currently carrying out investigations into the sustainability of their groundwater sources as part of their Business Plans, 2020-25 (Water Industry National Environment Programme [WINEP] investigations). These WINEP investigations are being undertaken to determine if their groundwater abstractions are impacting on surface water flows and the ability of a waterbody/waterbodies to achieve good hydrological status under the Water Framework Directive (WFD). Specifically for this development at Eye, the 'Broadland Rivers Chalk and Crag Groundwater unit' investigation is looking at the impact of groundwater abstraction on resulting base-flows to waterbodies in the River End 3

Waveney catchment. This groundwater unit failed the groundwater and dependent terrestrial ecosystem test in 2015.

It is likely that we will see further reductions in public water supply abstraction licences in the next few years as a result of the outcome of these investigations, which are due for completion 31/03/2022.

Our Abstraction Licensing Strategy for this area states that there is no additional groundwater availability and in order to reduce the risk of abstraction to the environment we have had to start a programme of reducing groundwater licences across East Anglia. More information can be found in our Abstraction Licensing Strategy: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/cams-broadland-abstraction-licensing-strategy>

Because of this we therefore advise:

- Water efficient measures within the new build – helping to keep per capita daily water demand down to 110 litres per person per day
- Measures to improve groundwater recharge where possible, this could also form part of ecological enhancements for the site.

We trust this advice is useful.

Historic England – Comments received 1st March 2021

On the basis of the information available to date, we do not wish to offer any comments. We suggest that you seek the views of your specialist conservation and archaeological advisers, as relevant.

It is not necessary for us to be consulted on this application again, unless there are material changes to the proposals. However, if you would like detailed advice from us, please contact us to explain your request.

Ministry of Defence Safeguarding Dept. – Comments received 10th February 2021

This application relates to site outside of Ministry of Defence safeguarding areas. We can therefore confirm that the Ministry of Defence has no safeguarding objections to this proposal.

County Council Responses (Appendix 5)

Archaeological Service – Comments received 11th February 2021

The development site is located just beyond the southeast boundary of the former Second World War airfield at Eye. A first phase of archaeological evaluation across the development area has defined extensive archaeological remains, recorded within the County Historic Environment Record (EYE 123).

Significant archaeological remains have been recorded in the western half of phase 1, comprising postholes ascribed to a possible Early Neolithic settlement site, alongside Early and Middle Iron Age occupation in the form of a trackway and also a series of discrete and dispersed pits and postholes. A number of features containing Roman material were located within the southern half of this area, likely to be a continuation of the Roman activity detected at Hartismere School (EYE 094). In the eastern half of this parcel, were three graves and a horse burial which are potentially of Anglo-Saxon date. These may form a small burial ground associated with the settlement site located to the south at Hartismere School (EYE 083). Although consideration has been given to preserving the cemetery *in situ* as an area of green space, the development will destroy known archaeological remains across the rest of this area.

Across the remainder of phase 1 and all of phase 2, only low-level evaluation has been undertaken so far, with scattered pits, postholes and ditches recorded. However, based upon the evaluation results so far and the recorded archaeology in the vicinity, there is a strong possibility that additional heritage assets of archaeological interest will be encountered across the rest of the development area. Any groundworks causing significant ground disturbance therefore have potential to damage or destroy any archaeological deposit that exists.

There are no grounds to consider refusal of permission in order to achieve preservation *in situ* of any important heritage assets. In accordance with paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework,

any permission granted should be the subject of a planning condition to record and advance understanding of the significance of the heritage asset before it is damaged or destroyed.

Archaeological conditions have been applied to granted application 3563/15.

Initial Development Contributions – Comments received 15th February 2021

I refer to the proposal: submission of details (reserved matters in part – phase 1) for outline planning permission 3563/15 – appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale for 138 dwellings including affordable housing, car parking, open space provision and associated infrastructure.

The outline planning application under reference 3563/15 has an associated planning obligation dated 26 March 2018. The planning obligations previously secured under the first planning permission must be retained in respect of this application if Mid Suffolk District Council make a resolution to approve.

The Eye Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). Policy EYE3 – Land south of Eye Airfield. Land with outline permission for 280 dwellings and a Care Home south of Eye Airfield should be developed in accord with the approved Design Brief.

Further Development Contributions – Comments received 3rd November 2021

I refer to the proposal: submission of details (reserved matters in part – phase 1) for outline planning permission 3563/15 – appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale for 138 dwellings including affordable housing, car parking, open space provision and associated infrastructure.

Reason(s) for re-consultation: revised plans dated 21/10/21.

Consultation responses were previously submitted by way of letters dated 30 November 2020, 15 February 2021, and 17 September 2021.

There are currently two separate reserved matters planning applications under references DC/21/00609 and DC/20/04067 (Parcel 15) for which outline planning permission was granted under reference 3563/15. This outline permission has a sealed planning obligation dated 26 March 2018, which is relevant to the two pending reserved matters applications. As set out in the letter dated 17 September 2021 local circumstances have changed in respect of the early years position i.e., there is no longer any early years facilities at St Peter & St Paul CEVA Primary School. The Sixth Schedule paragraph 1 of the planning obligation currently states that the Early Years Contribution and the Parcel 15 Early Years Contribution is to be used for improving and enhancing facilities and creating additional early years places with associated facilities at the existing early years setting at St Peter & St Paul CEVA Primary School. In the circumstances, prior to the grant of planning permission for either DC/21/00609 or DC/20/04067 a Deed of Variation needs to be entered into to amend the Sixth Schedule paragraph 1 to the following 'The County Council covenants to use the Early Years Contribution and the Parcel 15 Early Years Contribution for improving and enhancing facilities and creating additional early years places with associated facilities serving the Development in the Eye locality'.

N.B – a Deed of Variation to the Section 106 can be negotiated and agreed outside of the planning process.

Fire and Rescue Team – Comments received 10th February 2021

The Suffolk Fire & Rescue Service made comment on the original planning application, which we noted had been published. Please ensure that Condition 21 on that Decision Notice is brought forward to this planning application as we will require Fire Hydrants to be installed on all Phases of the build.

N.B – Conditions attached to the outline planning permission continue to apply and informatives are suggested to make this point clear. There is therefore no requirement to bring conditions forward as suggested here.

Initial Floods and Water Team – Comments received 24th February 2021

A holding objection is recommended at this time and is necessary because the applicant has not submitted any details of the proposed landscaping of the SuDS features and additional information needs to be submitted in relation to the attenuation basin design

The holding objection is a temporary position to allow reasonable time for the applicant and the LLFA to discuss what additional information is required in order to overcome the objection(s). This Holding Objection will remain the LLFA's formal position until the local planning authority (LPA) is advised to the contrary. If the LLFA position remains as a Holding Objection at the point the LPA wishes to determine the application, the LPA should treat the Holding Objection as a Formal Objection and recommendation for Refusal to the proposed development. The LPA should provide at least 2 weeks prior notice of the publication of the committee report so that the LLFA can review matters and provide suggested planning conditions, even if the LLFA position is a Formal Objection.

Further Floods and Water Team – Comments received 25th October 2021

Suffolk County Council, as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), have reviewed application ref DC/21/00609. The submitted documents have been reviewed and we recommend **approval** at this time.

Initial Highway Authority – Comments received 25th February

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

- Dimensions of the proposed roads and footways have not been supplied. By scaling, the widths are to Suffolk Design Guide. However, we recommend the footway widths are increased to 2.0m (as outlined in Manual for Streets).
- A drawing showing the forward visibility of the bends and junctions is required to ensure the layout meets with Suffolk Design Guide (for spine road) and Manual for Streets (for minor and shared surface roads).
- Department for Transport Local Transport Note 1/20 (LTN1/20) was published in July 2020 where 'cycling will play a far bigger part in our transport system from now on'. This national guidance aims to help cycling become a form of mass transit. A shared footway has been included in the design to accommodate cycling along the spine road.
- Shared surface roads are to have a maintenance strip 1m wide each side of the carriageway which allows the highway to be maintained and erection of street lighting. If these strips are to be considered for utility services plant, the strips need to be widened to 2m.
- The footway on the left side of the spine road is separated by a 1m wide verge which is the minimum width we will accept.
- Connectivity with the existing footway network is insufficient. When the next phase comes forward, the site will be linked to Victoria Hill but there are no pedestrian links to the footways on Gaye Crescent or Haygate (as indicated on the masterplan drawing supplied with the outline planning application).
- Connectivity to Public Rights of Way (PROW) network needs to be considered. The drawings are not showing any connections to the existing footpath (FP14) adjacent to the allotments and FP15 (on the east boundary of the site).
- No details have been supplied where the spine road intersects the PROW footpath 14 (& FP43) east of the sub-station near plot 56. We recommend a table-top crossing feature is introduced to allow safe access for pedestrians.

- We recommend all permissive footways within the site are to have bound surfacing to enable use throughout the year.
- Dimensions of the parking spaces and garages have not been specified, a standard car parking space is 2.5m x 5.0m and a standard garage is 3.0m x 7.0m. By scaling, the car parking spaces are the correct size but the garages are undersize.
- There are several 4 and 5 bed-roomed dwellings with triple parking layout. This layout is acceptable on private drives as indicated in Suffolk Guidance for Parking 2019. However, we would like to point out that this layout is not favoured by the Planning Committees so we recommend that all triple parking is removed.

We can recommend conditions once the above points have been addressed. We look forward to receiving further information.

Further Highway Authority – Comments received 5th November 2021

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

- Dimensions of the proposed roads and footways have not been supplied. By scaling, the widths are to Suffolk Design Guide.
- The forward visibility of the bends and junctions has not been supplied to show the layout meets with Suffolk Design Guide (for spine road) and Manual for Streets (for minor and shared surface roads).
- Connectivity to Public Rights of Way (PROW) network is not sufficient as highlighted in PROW response dated 29th October 2021 specifically no details have been supplied where the spine road intersects the PROW footpath 14 (& FP43) east of the sub-station near plot 40. We recommend a table-top crossing feature is introduced to allow safe access for pedestrians and the items raised by the PROW team.

We can recommend conditions once the above points have been addressed. We look forward to receiving further information.

N.B – Further plans have since been submitted that deal with these comments.

Initial Public Rights of Way Team – Comments received 11th March 2021

Thank you for your consultation concerning the above application, and please accept our apologies for not getting our response to you by the agreed extension deadline of 10.03.21. We would be grateful if you would still take the following into account:

The proposed site does contain public rights of way (PROW): Footpaths 13, 14 and 15 Eye all run through the proposed site. The Definitive Map for Eye can be seen at <https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/assets/Roads-and-transport/public-rights-of-way/Eye.pdf>. A more detailed plot of public rights of way can be provided. Please contact DefinitiveMaps@suffolk.gov.uk for more information. Note, there is a fee for this service.

We accept this proposal, however the Applicant MUST contact the Area Rights of Way Officer (sam.trayton@suffolk.gov.uk) to discuss their plans in relation to FP14 where the proposed estate road crosses it. It is unlawful to disturb the surface of a PROW without consent from us as the Highway Authority. It is also unlawful to obstruct a PROW without permission, therefore the Applicant should also discuss with us how construction will be managed around the routes on site. There is currently no plan showing the existing PROW and how they relate to the proposed site layout, and we think it is important for the Applicant produce such a plan as part of their application documents.

Further Public Rights of Way Team – Comments received 29th October 2021

Thank you for your consultation concerning the above application. For information, we last responded to this application on 11 March 2021. With this consultation we have been able to look at the details for Phase 1. As outlined in the previous response, the proposed site does contain public rights of way (PROW). This includes Eye Public Footpath 14 and Eye Public Footpath 43 which run north-south through Phase 1, and Eye Public Footpath 15 which lies on the western boundary of Phase 1.

We accept this proposal. It is encouraging to see the details for Phase 1 and the proposed new walking and cycling routes through the development that connect to existing public rights of way. However, we do have the following comments to make:

- A diversion of Eye Public Footpath 14 and Eye Public Footpath 43 may be required where crossed by the spine road.
- Early contact with the rights of way team is essential to identify if this is needed and progress any legal order making. Please note, legal works will carry a timescale.
- The crossing of Eye Public Footpath 14 and Eye Public Footpath 43 by the spine road will also need to be discussed with regard to this being a safe crossing – a raised platform, or similar, may be required at this point.
- Site plans for Phase 1 indicate proposed cycle and pedestrian routes connecting to existing public rights of way. It is unlawful to cycle on a footpath so Eye Public Footpath 14 will need to be upgraded to bridleway status and surfaced appropriately to ensure ongoing cycle journeys are possible.
- The legal works for this will be £5,000 and will need to be provided as a Section 106 obligation under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- Any physical works required to Eye Public Footpath 14 will need to be delivered as a Section 278 agreement under the Highways Act 1980.
- Off-site works to improve the Public Rights of Way network may also be required to ensure ongoing journeys from the development on foot or by cycle into Eye town centre, onto promoted trails, and into the wider countryside are commensurate with the future needs of the community.
- These improvements should encourage and enable sustainable and accessible journeys and a full costing of these offsite improvements will be provided in due course. Any improvements will need to be provided as a Section 106 obligation under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- The Design Statement, 5.25 states “Where possible pedestrian links will be suitable for use by disabled people”. There is a concern as to why this would not be possible in all instances.

Travel Plan Officer – Comments received 10th February 2021

Thank you for consulting me about the reserved matters planning application for phase one of the residential development at Land to the South of Eye Airfield and North of Castleton Way in Eye. On reviewing the application documents, I have no comment to make for this specific application, as the Residential Travel Plan requirement is secured through the supporting Section 106 Agreement.

Internal Consultee Responses (Appendix 6)

Environmental Health Team - Land Contamination – Comments received 8th March 2021

Many thanks for your comments in relation to the above submission. I can confirm that I have no comments with respect to land contamination but would recommend contacting the Environment Agency who previously requested conditions relating to land contamination at the site and the protection of groundwater.

Heritage Team – Comments received 10th February 2021

The Heritage Team do not wish to offer comment on this application.

Place Services Ecology – Comments received 16th March 2021

We have reviewed the submitted documents for this application, including the Breeding Bird Update (MLM, January 2019), Great Crested Newt eDNA Survey (MLM, June 2018) and Skylark Mitigation Plan. Furthermore, we have assessed the ecological survey reports submitted at outline stage. This included the Phase 1 Survey (James Blake Associates, September 2014), Breeding Bird Survey (MLM, October 2015), Great Crested Newt Survey (MLM, October 2015), Reptile Survey (MLM, October 2015) Building Inspection and Bat Detector Survey (MLM, October 2015).

These documents provide the LPA with certainty of the likely impacts on designated sites, protected and Priority species/habitats and, with appropriate mitigation measures secured, the development can be made acceptable.

Public Realm Team – Comments received 17th February 2021

Public Realm Officers note the references made to the deficiencies in open space provision in Eye and welcome the inclusion of large areas of open spaces with the overall development master plan. Officers support the level of open space provision associated with this phase of development and the overall approach to delivering public open space and play opportunities on this site.

Initial Strategic Housing Team – Comments received 22nd March 2021

There is a signed s106 associated with this proposal which requires the submission of an Affordable Housing Scheme for the Council to consider at reserved matters application stage. Please can this be forwarded for the Strategic Housing team, this is to include size (NDSS), specification, phasing and distribution across the whole site. We also wish to see the maximum occupancy proposed for each affordable dwelling.

The open market mix should ensure that it follows the SHMA recommendations as follows:

The table below sets out the recommendations in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (updated 2019) for new owner-occupied dwellings for the next 18 years up to 2036.

Table 4.4e Size of new owner-occupied accommodation required in Mid Suffolk over the next 18 years

Size of home	Current size profile	Size profile 2036	Change required	% of change required
One bedroom	707	1,221	515	7.2%
Two bedrooms	5,908	8,380	2,472	34.4%
Three bedrooms	13,680	15,784	2,104	29.3%
Four or + bedrooms	12,208	14,303	2,096	29.2%
Total	32,502	39,688	7,186	100.0%

From the plans provided it would appear that the provision of 2 bedroomed accommodation within this proposal is lower than the SHMA target so the Council would be looking for an uplift in the number of 2 bed dwellings for open market sale on this development and a reduction in the number of 3 and 4 bedrooms.

Further Strategic Housing Team – Comments received 8th November 2021

This is an application for 138 dwellings.

There are 2 phases for this site. The ‘signed’ section states that the developer needs to provide 20% affordable housing.

Phase 1 has been put forward for approval at reserved matters stage. At this stage we expect to agree the detail of each affordable housing dwelling and its location.

Phase 1 has a total of 138 dwellings and therefore a total of 28 dwellings will need to be provided on site as per the signed S106.

However, having looked at the response done previously there seems to be some discrepancy and would ask for the following to be changed.

1. We need all 3 bedroom houses to be for 5 persons and not 4 as stated above. We would expect to see plots 99,100,125, 126, 127 and 128 to be changed to 3 bedroom 5 person houses and the size to be changed to 93sqm from the proposed 90sqm.
2. Also we note that plots 80, 81, 82 and 83 are for 2 bedroom 3 persons houses again these are not acceptable and we would ask for them to be changed to 2 bedroom 4 person houses with a sqm no smaller than 79sqm from the proposed 62sqm.

These amendments affect a total of 10 dwellings over a third of all those being delivered on site.

I also note that it is proposed to build 7 x 3 bedroom starter homes when our earlier response agreed a limit of 6 x 3 bedroom and 10 x 2 bedroom starter homes for both phases. We need to ask that one of the 3 bedrooms is changed to a 2 bedroom 4 person dwelling. Please can you ensure that Phase 2 only has 2 bedroom starter homes on site. As you can see from our earlier responses the need in our districts is predominately for 1 and 2 bedroom homes and not three to four.

N.B – Revised plans have been submitted which deal with the issues raised by the Strategic Housing Team.

Other Consultee Responses (Appendix 7)

British Horse Society – Comments received 10th February 2021

The British Horse Society has no objection to this application in principle but believes that the equestrian community have been excluded from these proposals. There is an active equestrian community surrounding Stowmarket who will be affected by this development. Nationally equestrians have just 22% of the rights of way network. In Suffolk, they have just 18% of the rights of way network, increasingly disjointed by roads which were once quiet and are now heavily used by traffic resulting from development within the County. It is therefore important that these public rights are protected.

Mid Suffolk Disability Forum – Comments received 10th February 2021

All dwellings should be visitable and meet Part M4(1) of the Building Regulations, and at least 50% of the dwellings should also meet the 'accessible and adaptable' standard Part M4(2). It is our view that in housing developments of over 10 dwellings, at least one of the dwellings should be built to wheelchair standard Part M4(3).

It is also our view that 3% of the dwellings in housing developments of over 10 dwellings should be bungalows to assist people with mobility problems and to assist people who wish to downsize from larger dwellings. It has not been possible to ascertain how many bungalows are included within this development.

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.

Surfaces should be firm, durable and level. No loose gravel, cobbles or uneven setts should be used.

Suffolk Preservation Society – Comment received 3rd March 2021

The SPS do not wish to comment on this application.

Suffolk Wildlife Trust – Comments received 3rd March 2021

We note as part of the proposals that open spaces will be created within the development, as well as a woodland belt around the eastern and northern site boundary and attenuation basins. However, it is unclear what species will be used for the replacement planting which will be submitted within a later application. Whilst the application dictates that these features will be planted, there is no indication of the composition and range of species. In order to maximise the potential for biodiversity, a diverse range of native species should be used and this detailed within a planting specification. A Landscape and Ecological Management Plan should also be produced to detail how the habitats and open spaces on site are to be appropriately managed for biodiversity. These should be secured as a condition of planning consent, should permission be granted.

We have read the Breeding Bird Update (MLM, January 2019) and are satisfied with the findings of the consultant. A Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy should be produced, detailing the how the enhancements made within the update, as well as from the ecological reports detailed in Condition 8 of outline application 3563/15, are to be incorporated within the development, including their locations.

As foraging and commuting bats were identified as potentially using hedgerows and trees adjacent to the site with the outline application 3563/15 (Building Inspection and Bat Detector Survey, MLM, October 2015), then it is important that there is no light spill from external lighting and that dark corridors are retained around the site for the foraging and commuting bats. Therefore, a lighting strategy in accordance with current guidelines¹ should be designed. This should be implemented as a condition of planning consent, should permission be granted.

We note the Skylark Mitigation Plan accompanying the application, however no detail is supplied regarding management measures, monitoring or the length of time it is to be implemented. It is also unclear whether a number of the plots are on hardstanding, or close to access routes. Therefore, the mitigation plan should be updated to address these concerns.

We recommend that integral swift nest bricks should be incorporated into buildings that are of minimum two storeys. The incorporation of swift nest bricks is an established way to enhance biodiversity within a development and provide net gain. Therefore, we request that this is done to provide enhancement to this Suffolk Priority Species, whose numbers have seen a dramatic decline in recent years.

There are records of Hedgehog, a UK and Suffolk Priority Species, in the surrounding area. To maintain connectivity for this species, we recommend maintaining hedgehog permeable boundaries (with gaps of 13x13cm at ground level) as part of this development to maintain connectivity for the species.

B: Representations

At the time of writing this report at least 2 letters/emails/online comments have been received. It is the officer opinion that this represents 2 general comments. A verbal update shall be provided as necessary.

Views are summarised below:

- Shadow flicker from the wind turbines on Eye Airfield may be an issue. Enforcement action resulted in management equipment being installed and calibrated to reduce the impact on existing properties. New properties should be similarly protected.
- Reduction in the size of the buffer zone between the outline application and the reserved matters application. No indication on application who would be responsible for the maintenance of the buffer zone and amenity areas within the site.

(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: 3563/15	Outline planning permission sought for a proposed development comprising up to 280 dwellings; a 60 bed residential care home, the re-provision of a car park for the use of Mulberry Bush Nursery; re-location of existing farm buildings to the west of Parcel 15; and associated infrastructure including roads (including adaptations to Castleton Way and Langton Grove) pedestrian, cycle and vehicle routes, parking, drainage, open spaces, landscaping, utilities and associated earthworks.	DECISION: GTD 27.03.2018
REF: 1658/15	Formal request for a screening opinion for the erection of 290 Dwellings, new internal road Layout, parking, open space, landscaping and associated infrastructure	DECISION: EAN 01.09.2015
REF: DC/20/04067	Submission of details (Reserved Matters in Part) for Outline Planning Permission 3563/15 - Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for Erection of 15no. dwellings	DECISION: PCO
REF: DC/21/00609	Submission of details (Reserved Matters in Part-Phase 1) for Outline Planning Permission 3563/15 - Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for 138 dwellings, including affordable housing, car parking, open space provision and associated infrastructure.	DECISION: PCO

PART THREE – ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION

1. The Site and Surroundings

- 1.1 The application site is located to the north-west of the Town of Eye. Victoria Hill is located to the east of the site and Castleton Way is located to the south. The site comprises part of Eye Airfield, a now disused wartime airfield. Industrial and commercial development is located further to the west adjacent to the A140 located to the west. At present the site is composed of agricultural land which is clear, open and gently undulating.
- 1.2 The site forms part of the allocated housing site in the Eye Neighbourhood Plan (Policy Eye 4) known as land south of Eye Airfield; it benefits from a 2018 outline planning permission (3563/15) for up to 280 dwellings, a 60-bed residential care home, nursery car park and the re-location of farm buildings. It should be noted that application DC/20/04067 would deliver 15 of the 280 allocated dwellings leaving 265 dwellings to be delivered along with the 60-bed care home.
- 1.3 Existing residential development is located along the southern and eastern boundaries of the application site. A number of Grade II listed buildings are located to the north-east of the site and the Eye Conservation Area is located to the south of the application site. A number of public rights of way are noted within the site itself and part of the site sits within an area of archaeological potential.

2. The Proposal

- 2.1 This application seeks to provide reserved matters details pursuant to the outline planning permission. In this regard, the details under consideration relate to appearance, layout, landscaping and scale.
- 2.2 Access has already been determined as part of the outline. For the avoidance of doubt the outline application allows for a maximum of 15 dwellings to utilise the existing access to the site off Langton Grove. These dwellings are accommodated within application DC/20/04067, therefore, all the dwellings within this application will be served via the creation of a new access point onto Castleton Way. In addition, two pedestrian, cycle and emergency vehicle accesses off Haygate and Victoria Hill are to be brought forward as part of the overall scheme. The connection to Victoria Hill is proposed to be brought forward in line with the delivery of the dwellings within this application as is the car park.
- 2.3 This application covers an area of 4.65ha and brings forward 138 new residential dwellings, including 28 affordable dwellings. It is positioned as a first phase of development for the remaining 265 dwellings allocated on the site. The remaining 127 dwellings to be delivered as part of the application will be delivered as part of a separate approval process.
- 2.4 Of the 138 dwellings brought forward within this application, the open market housing mix is as follows and includes the delivery of 21 bungalows:

No. Beds	No. of Units
2	10
3	58
4	16

5	26
TOTAL	110

- 2.5 The 28 affordable dwellings equate to an on-site delivery of 20% of all dwellings as affordable housing. This accords with the existing Section 106 Agreement for the site, agreed as part of the outline planning permission. The affordable housing mix is as follows and includes the delivery of four bungalows:

No. Beds	No. of Units
2	16
3	12
TOTAL	28

Affordable dwellings are spread throughout the site in groups of no more than 6 dwellings each and are intended to provide 12 units for affordable rent, 9 units for shared ownership and 7 units for discount market value sale.

- 2.6 Development within the site is set around a number of large areas of public open space such that its frames and overlooks the open space to enhance passive surveillance of the area and is supported by a main spine road running through the site which is intended to be lined with trees. The main route curves within the site and no property is given direct access to it, rather, properties are served by secondary shared surface streets and private drives.
- 2.7 Parking within the scheme has been designed to meet the requirements of adopted parking standards. Overall, the proposed development incorporates:
- 302 no. allocated parking spaces.
 - 16 no. allocated parking spaces within garages.
 - 90 no. unallocated parking spaces within garages.
 - 36 no. visitor parking spaces.
 - 138 no. cycle parking spaces.

Where parking is within garages, internal dimensions for each space measures 7m x 3m while parking bays measure 5m x 2.5m. Triple parking has been excluded from the entirety of the site. In instances where a dwelling requires three parking spaces an additional parking space is provided to the frontage of the dwelling or to its side.

- 2.8 Ducting for electric vehicle charging is provided to all units to allow the installation of charging unit at a later date and covered, secure cycle parking is provided for all units.
- 2.9 Building heights include a number of single storey bungalows, as well as a small number of 2.5 storey dwellings placed at strategic points within the site while the majority (75%) of development within the site will be two storeys high. Lower height buildings are located close to areas of open space and the fringes of the site, with two storey development located along the main routes through the site. Each dwelling is to be delivered with a good-sized private amenity space and back-to-back distances are considered to be acceptable.
- 2.10 The following material palette is proposed for the dwellings:
- Walls materials:
 - Red brick; and
 - Render (colour: salmon, blue, cream and off-white/grey).

- Roofing materials:
 - Slate effect tile;
 - Red pantile; and
 - Grey tile.
- Doors, windows and other materials:
 - Black front doors;
 - White barge boards/fascias/canopies;
 - White uPVC windows;
 - Black rainwater goods.

Materials are proposed to vary throughout the development to better and denote the various character areas within the site.

3. The Principle of Development

- 3.1 The site benefits from outline planning permission under reference 3563/15. This position is reflected within the Eye Neighbourhood Plan.
- 3.2 An indicative masterplan was produced and approved at outline stage. While the proposed layout follows the design principles set out within the indicative masterplan, it should be noted that the masterplan is *indicative* only and therefore some degree of deviation from it is acceptable. It forms part of the suite of approved plans consented at the outline stage only insofar as it relates to access points to the site and the developable area. A developer is free to amend a development as they wish within the confines of the approved description of development. The key test is determining whether the revised layout accords with the development principles consented at the outline stage. In this case, Officers consider that this test is met. The reserved matters application considered here brings forward residential development, as contemplated at the outline stage. The fact that the layout is not strictly in full accordance with the indicative masterplan is not a fatal to the application. The development therefore accords with the outline planning permission and the neighbourhood plan allocation.

4. Nearby Services and Connections Assessment of Proposal

- 4.1 Eye is located at the pinnacle of the settlement hierarchy set out within Core Strategy policy CS1. The site is located close to the established community and within walking distance of the town centre such that access could be made on foot or by bicycle. This would give access to a wide range of services and facilities as well as public transport nodes, education facilities and healthcare.
- 4.2 The reserved matters application seeks to integrate itself within the pedestrian and cycle network within Eye to enhance its permeability and better integrate itself into the surrounding area. A footpath/cycleway is proposed to run alongside the main route through the site connecting to Eye at Victoria Hill. Connection to the existing public rights of way network is also proposed along with connection to neighbouring residential development passing through the proposed open space within the site.
- 4.3 SCC Public Rights of Way Team comments on pedestrian links within the site are noted. Given these may connect to land outside of the ownership of the applicant, where possible they will be made accessible to disabled users, however, existing gradients may prevent this.

5. Design and Layout

- 5.1 The design of the scheme has been revised significantly in collaboration with representatives of Eye Town Council, Persimmon and Pegasus such that it better reflects the indicative masterplan and supporting design brief previously agreed.
- 5.2 The design of the site changes through four distinct character areas starting at the entrance to the site from Castleton Way and the edge of the development through to more densely occupied streets closer to Eye and finally, lower rise development surrounding the open space.

Character Area 1 – Eye Gateway

Forms the entrance of the development and shows a formal gateway appearance of continual frontages of predominantly two-storey terraced dwellings. Materials proposed as red brick with some render in colours traditionally seen within Eye with slate tiles and pantiles to roofs. Flat entrance canopies are noted as are details such as quoins and splayed headers. Occasional chimneys are noted in prominent locations and dwellings are set back to provide front gardens and additional soft landscaping.

Character Area 2 – Green Edge

Positioned along the edges of the development at locations where development will interface with countryside beyond the application site and also the allotment site. Looser urban grain to development when compared to the gateway character area. Again, predominately two-storey development, although now detached with larger gardens. Materials are proposed as predominantly red brick with dental course detailing and occasional use of cream render. Slate tiles are used to the roofs.

Character Area 3 – Hayward Greenway

Used to frame open space and arranged in a crescent, dwellings within this area are typically low density and predominantly single storey. This area forms the transition between the open space and development within the site. Again, red brick is predominant with occasional use of cream render and pantiles are utilised for roofs. Additional glazing detail is added to windows. Chimneys are added to prominent buildings and canopies are again utilised as with the Gateway. Timber bollards separate public open space from private.

Character Area 4 – Neighbourhood Housing

Mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings with occasional 2.5 storey dwellings to show key landmarks and nodal points within the site. Predominant use of red brick and occasional detailing and use of off-white/grey render with slate tile and pantiles noted to roofs. Dwellings here form the core of the development and mirrors the village street design suggested within the design brief. Development is high density with tight urban form and consistent dwelling line.

- 5.3 It is considered that the proposed design meets with the requirements set out within paragraph 130 of the NPPF as well as Saved Local Plan policy GP1 and H15. Policy Eye16 of the Eye Neighbourhood Plan is directly applicable to these considerations and sets out a number of considerations with regards to design and materials. It is considered that the proposed design meets a number of these requirements, most notably responding well to surrounding development and the built form shown within the historic core of Eye.
- 5.4 An energy strategy has been provided by the applicant in order to provide detail of the requirements of Condition 12 of the Outline Planning Permission. It notes that some properties within the site are to be developed with photovoltaic panels installed to south facing roofs and that optional installation of panels is being explored by the developer. Insulation on each dwelling is to

exceed the requirements of Building Regulations Part L by 10% while the emission rate for the site will better the requirements of Building Regulations Part L by 19%. Increased insulation, thermal bridging and passive solar gain are all intended to be utilised.

- 5.5 Gas condensing boilers are proposed to be installed within the initial phase of build out within the site, however, changes to Building Regulations will require other units within the scheme to be brought forward with heat pumps once regulations are altered by Government. Green utility connection is to be offered to all purchasers.

6. Landscape Impact, Trees, Ecology, Biodiversity and Protected Species

- 6.1 Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy seeks to protect and conserve landscape qualities taking into account the natural environment and the historical dimension of the landscape as a whole rather than concentrating solely on selected areas, protecting the District's most important components and encouraging development that is consistent with conserving its overall character. However, blanket protection for the natural or historic environment as espoused by Policy CS5 is not consistent with the Framework and is afforded limited weight.
- 6.2 Paragraph 170 of the NPPF states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils.
- 6.3 Details of landscaping are supplied with the application and include the following significant elements:
- Entrance Area – Create pleasant green frontage to development. Proposed tree, wildflower and bulb planting to create colour and interest.
 - Central Open Space – Key landscape feature within site. Provides open space, feature play area, orchard tree planting, grassed areas for informal play and footways and cycleway links.
 - Southern Green Crescent – Informal green space. Hosts attenuation basin and access links. Native shrub and tree planting proposed.
 - Woodland Buffer – Linear buffer to northern and western edges of development to form woodland. Native species planted to strengthen and form green visual edge to development.
 - Pocket Parks – Two to be located within housing areas. Small, landscaped spaces offering seating and subtle play features for younger children.
 - Archaeological Area – Limited landscaping proposed to this area. Interpretation of archaeology to be considered.
 - Tree Lined Road – Central route through the site. Mix of tree species to create year-round interest and colour when moving through development.
- 6.4 Planting within the remainder of the site to be reflective of the character area. Frontage gardens to the spine road to be more formally planted and to secondary streets, less so.
- 6.5 Eye is noted to be deficient in terms of the availability of open space within the town and the quantity and quality of open space to be provided as part of this application is welcomed especially when consideration of the connectivity of the site both to Eye and the wider countryside is noted. Benefits in terms of open space delivery from this site are considered to be felt more widely within Eye.
- 6.6 The Council's retained ecological consultant has advised that with regards to ecology and biodiversity, the development can be made acceptable. Suggested conditions are noted in this

regard and recommended to be attached to any positive determination of this application. It is not considered that the development would give rise to adverse impacts with regards to ecology, biodiversity or protected species.

7. Land Contamination, Flood Risk, Drainage and Waste

- 7.1 No objection is noted from the Council's Environmental Health team with regards to land contamination and the submitted flood risk details are considered to be acceptable to the County Council's Flood and Water Team.
- 7.2 Anglian Water have considered that foul water flows can be adequately accommodated within their system and while they note that the developer has not made contact regarding surface water drainage, it is not a requirement that this be done at the planning stage and more normally occurs post-planning with the developer required to ensure that the network can accommodate any flows in this regard.

8. Heritage Issues

- 8.1 A number of Grade II listed buildings are noted to the north-east of the site and the site is around 150m (at its closest point) to the Eye Conservation Area.
- 8.2 In consultation on the outline planning application, Historic England noted that development on the site could result in harm to these designated heritage assets. In consulting on this application where further detail has been provided neither Historic England, the Council's retained heritage advisor or the Suffolk Preservation Society have responded to note an objection to the proposed reserved matters details.
- 8.3 It is therefore considered that the proposed development would not adversely affect designated heritage assets to such a degree that they would be considered to constitute harm to either the setting of the listed buildings or the conservation area.
- 8.4 Planning conditions to secure archaeological investigation of the site have already been applied to the outline planning permission.

9. Impact on Residential Amenity

- 9.1 Saved Policy H13 of the Local Plan seeks to ensure new housing development protects the amenity of neighbouring residents. Saved Policy H16 of the Local Plan seeks to protect the existing amenity of residential areas. 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 all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.
- 9.2 Back-to-back distances within the site are good and a landscaped buffer exists to separate the proposed dwellings from those positioned along Castleton Way. It is considered that sufficient private amenity space is provided to all dwellings. No concerns have been raised in this regard by statutory consultees or neighbouring dwellings in objection to the application. Concern regarding strobing effects from nearby turbines are noted, however, this has already been considered within the layout of the proposed development such that dwellings are orientated and positioned to mitigate this impact.

10. Planning Obligations / CIL

- 10.1 An existing Section 106 Agreement exists which covers the development and secures the following (with monetary contributions index linked):
- 20% of on site units to be occupied as affordable housing.
 - Early years education contribution of £161,411.
 - Total (primary and secondary) education contributions of £1,673,525.
 - Full residential travel plan.
 - Workforce travel plan.
 - Healthcare contribution of £100,380.
 - Highways Safety contribution of £70,982.
 - Library contribution of £57,240.
 - Open space provision and maintenance.
 - Public rights of way contribution of £43,678.
 - Public transport contribution of £35,018.
 - Sports facilities contribution of £100,000.
- 10.2 Comments from SCC regarding a required deed of variation to the Section 106 Agreement is required. This does not prevent the Local Planning Authority from delivering reserved matters approval on this site and can be negotiated separately from the planning process.
- 10.3 The delivery of residential dwellings will also deliver CIL.

11. Town Council Comments

- 11.1 Eye Town Council have been heavily involved in renegotiating the scheme during the course of this application. The layout has been subject to change and the scheme now more closely resembles the impression given within the design brief agreed at outline stage. Their submitted comments reflect this, however, two further points are raised.
- 11.2 With regards to design, opposition is noted to use of standard house types. With regards to the submission before members a number of alterations and non-standard house types are noted within the scheme, most notably within the entrance to the site where terraced house types are arranged in a curve and also around the open space, where non-standard bungalows have been utilised. Standard house types have been presented with additional detailing and materials reflective of Eye such that they would not appear to be out of keeping within the surrounding area. The Town Council specifically note that their objection in this regard is not sufficient in their view to oppose the granting of this reserved matters application.
- 11.3 Policy Eye3 sets out a housing mix which should be achieved across all the various residential development sites within the Neighbourhood Plan. Development should deliver a mix of house types consistent with the policy with deviation only to be brought forward with supporting evidence.
- 11.4 In this instance the Developer has cited the changing preferences of customers as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic showing a desire for three-bedroomed units over 2 bedroomed ones to provide additional space to work from home. The Town Council would like to see this addressed when considering the details of phase two development on this site such that delivery of housing across the site is more in line with the adopted policy.

PART FOUR – CONCLUSION

12. Planning Balance and Conclusion

- 12.1 In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the adopted development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. For the purposes of this application the adopted development plan includes the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy Focussed Review (2012), Mid Suffolk Core Strategy (2008) and Mid Suffolk Local Plan (1998).
- 12.2 Consideration of the principle of development and whether the site is a sustainable one for housing delivery has already been undertaken through the outline planning permission (3563/15). Following this determination, the site has been allocated within the Eye Neighbourhood Plan.
- 12.3 To that end, this application seeks agreement of the reserved matters of appearance, layout, landscaping and scale. Access having already been agreed under the outline.
- 12.4 The layout of the site would provide a significant amount of open space within the development and Eye is noted as being deficient in its provision of open space. A number of significant landscaping components and associated planting would be delivered as part of the application and no ecological harm is noted as a result of the proposed development.
- 12.5 The layout of the development has been discussed and amended during the course of the application. The resultant layout now suits all parties and would deliver an attractive, open development. The appearance of development within the scheme shifts within the site dependent on its location and the overall design is traditional, taking key elements of design from the character of development seen within Eye itself and is reflective of the traditional design aesthetic visible within the town.
- 12.6 In terms of scale, no concerns are raised in this regard. The site is predominantly two-storey with occasional 2.5 storey development and some single storey development mainly set around the Haygate Greenway.
- 12.7 The recommendation put before members is to approve the reserved matters as brought forward.

RECOMMENDATION

That authority be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer to grant the reserved matters application subject to the following conditions and informatives:

Conditions

- Reserved matters granted pursuant to 3563/15. Conditions attached to 3563/15 remain in force.
- Development to be brought forward in accordance with approved plans and documents.
- Garages to be retained as parking.
- Bicycle parking to be provided prior to occupation.
- Electric vehicle ducting to be provided prior to occupation.

Informatives

- Reminder that both the outline and reserved matters decisions form the planning permission for this site and that both continue to apply.
- Confirmation on any conditions discharged as part of this application.
- Informatives recommended by Anglian Water.
- Informative on discovery of unexpected contamination during development.
- Informative on public rights of way.

For the avoidance of doubt, the conditions attached to the outline planning permission already granted remain in place, they secure the following:

- Soft landscaping scheme;
- Control of emergency access points;
- Site levels (both existing and proposed);
- Boundary treatments for individual properties;
- Design of the care home be limited to two storeys;
- Ecological mitigation;
- Restriction on use of piling;
- Implementation of the soft landscaping scheme;
- Energy and renewables strategy in accordance with policy CS3 to be submitted and agreed;
- Details of illumination within the site;
- Archaeological investigation of the site;
- Submission of post investigation report;
- Waste minimisation and recycling strategy to be submitted and agreed;
- Tree protection for retained trees and hedgerows;
- Landscape management plan to be submitted and agreed;
- Provision of fire hydrants within site;
- Construction management plan to be submitted and agreed;
- Land contamination process to be followed;
- Delivery of access on Castleton Way;
- Delivery of zebra crossing and school drop off area;
- Delivery of internal carriageways and footways;

- HGV deliveries to accord with delivery management plan which is to be submitted and agreed;
and
- Delivery of access to Langton Grove.

Given these will remain in force, there is no requirement to reimpose these conditions on this reserved matters application.