

Committee Report

Item No: 7A

Reference: DC/21/05669

Case Officer: Elizabeth Flood

Ward: Bramford

Ward Member/s: Cllr James Caston

RECOMMENDATION –GRANT RESERVED MATTERS PLANNING PERMISSION WITH CONDITIONS

Description of Development

Application for approval of the outstanding Reserved Matters following grant of Outline Permission DC/19/01401- Residential development of up to 115 dwellings and access, including open space and landscaping - Details for Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale required under Conditions 1 and 2 and concurrently required details of Surface Water Drainage (Condition 12); Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Condition 15); Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy (Condition 16); Landscaping (Condition 18) and Housing Mix (Condition 22).

Location

Land To The South Of, Fitzgerald Road, Bramford, Suffolk

Expiry Date: 20/01/2022

Application Type: RES - Reserved Matters

Development Type: Major Large Scale - Dwellings

Applicant: Mrs R.M. Wintour & Hopkins Homes Limited

Agent: Mr Chris Smith

Parish: Bramford

Site Area: 9.08 ha

Details of Previous Committee / Resolutions and any member site visit: 11th March 2022, details below.

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

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

PART ONE – REASON FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE

The application is referred to committee for the following reason:

- The application is a Major Application, requiring determination by Planning Committee as the number of residential units proposed exceeds 15 no. in total.

Update following deferral of application at Planning Committee on the 11th March 2020

This application was deferred at Planning Committee on the 23rd March 2022 for the following reasons:

Defer to resolve:

- Review and reduce triple parking and review design of parking courts
- Re-design Plot 886 (flat above garage)
- Cycleway – review cycleway along Lorraine Way
- Tree species to be reviewed
- Review non-functioning design details
- Review footpath surfacing

Following this referral, the developer has provided revised plans to try to resolve the Councillors' concerns.

This updated report provides an assessment of these revised plans and how they relate to the reasons for deferring the application. The pertinent paragraphs are 2.2, 2.3, 5.3, 6.8, and 11.1.

PART TWO – POLICIES AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Summary of Policies

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
GP01 - Design and layout of development
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

CL08 - Protecting wildlife habitats

Other Material Planning Documents

National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

Nationally Described Space Standards (2019)

Suffolk Adopted Parking Standards (2015)

Suffolk Design Guide (2000)

Emerging Local Plan

LA006 - Allocation: Land south of Fitzgerald Road, Bramford

Neighbourhood Plan Status

Bramford Parish Plan and Village Design Statement (2012) - The application site is not identified within the Parish Plan Area. The Parish Plan does not form part of the development plan but is considered to be a material consideration.

Sproughton Neighbourhood Plan (2020) - The application site is not within the plan area. Accordingly, the Neighbourhood Plan carries little weight.

Consultations and Representations

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

A: Summary of Consultations Town/Parish Council (Appendix 3)

Bramford Parish Council

Bramford Parish Council wishes to add further objections and comments to the outstanding Reserved Matters.

Cycle provision

The application has no mention of cycle provision on site, or any cycle links to other cycle paths in the local area. Popular National Cycle routes run very close to this site, we trust that the developer will improve the existing plan to accommodate cyclists providing safe access to Ipswich for commuting to reduce car journeys, and also pleasure cyclists

Footpaths

Pedestrian connectivity is poor, paths are not continuous and do not provide safe pedestrian routes on or off site. There is no provision for pedestrians to cross over Fitzgerald Rd to access schools, shops etc. Junction of PROW meeting Vicarage Lane is a danger, no visibility, an obvious accident spot. No paths are in place at road junctions on/off site. PROW that passes through development has a road crossing over it. No details of how the developer intends to make this safe for pedestrians. This path has high usage currently due to access to Sproughton and circular

river walks, it must be clarified. Could path running parallel to Fitzgerald Road on development be a shared path and cycle provision?

Access roads and levels

Whilst the access roads have been agreed in previous application, Hopkins are unable to provide information on how they plan to construct the roads at the junctions of Fitzgerald Road as there is a change of ground levels. Concerns are raised that residents of street facing properties of Fitzgerald Rd may choose the park in the street.

Inappropriate road surface

Some of the road surfaces to homes have been designed with a non-permeable 'tar spray and shingle finish in buff colour' Bramford Parish Council raise concerns that this surface is not in keeping with the sensitive rural location.

House Type

Bramford Parish Council do not feel the house type 886 is in keeping with the local area.

Play Area

Whilst Bramford Parish Council are pleased with the provision of a large green space, we feel the play area is not large enough for the potential footfall being so close to the busy PROW.

Maintenance of Green Space

There appears no plan regarding maintenance of the green space and trees.

Tree species and numbers

Whilst they are native, many are not local, we wish to see more trees and wildlife hedgerows planted with an edible landscape approach including local apple and pear. NPPF Para 131 requests tree lined streets, which are not part of this application. A greater number of trees would be preferred on the far boundary that runs parallel with the River Gipping. Comments from DC/19/01401 state the development should not have a visible impact of walkers on the River Gipping public footpath. With current design the new development will be visible, any trees planted will take many years to soften this view, therefore it is important they are planted as soon as possible and as large as possible.

Basins

There are no details of the inlet/outlet pipes for the SuDS basin, we request that due to prominent location they are not precast concrete with galvanised handrail as in other Hopkins development in the village. These are unsightly and constantly a target of vandalism. There is no detail of depth of these ponds or fencing. We require more details on this matter as they are very close to PROW and children's play area and have potential to cause harm. Developer states they are creating a 'natural wetland area' but there are no specifics regarding this

Ecology/Wildlife Friendly Construction

Bramford Parish Council would like to request a wildlife-friendly construction

1. Swift bird-friendly bricks
2. Hedgehog highway
3. Bee bricks
4. Amphibian friendly kerbing

New homes producing less carbon

We ask that whilst legislation does not force the developer on this project to choose alternative heat sources, use of solar, recycling water etc we hope that Hopkins Homes will be a trailblazer moving forward and install appropriate carbon reducing facilities on all new developments moving forward starting with this application. It is not appropriate new builds are provided with heating etc that would not be compliant only months later.

Sproughton Parish Council

Sproughton parish Council are concerned that the parking provisions appear inadequate and in line with our previous comments, the SUDS facilities are inadequate.

National Consultee (Appendix 4)

Natural England

NO OBJECTION - SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATE MITIGATION BEING SECURED

We consider that without appropriate mitigation the application could:

- have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Stour and Orwell Estuaries Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site
- damage or destroy the interest features for which the underpinning Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) of the above European sites have been notified.

In order to mitigate these adverse effects and make the development acceptable, the following mitigation measures are required / or the following mitigation options should be secured:

- A Landscape and Ecology Management Plan and the Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy, as required in order to discharge conditions 15 and 16.

Officer note: these documents have been provided as part of the application.

National Highways

No objection

County Council Responses (Appendix 5)

Highways:

The proposed layout is acceptable to the Highway Authority.

All of the necessary highway related conditions were included in the outline permission (DC/19/01401) and whilst the parking and bin collection elements of this proposal are generally acceptable, they do not contain enough details to supersede or fully discharge those conditions (8 and 9).

Condition 18 (landscaping): It should be noted that any trees close to adoptable roads and footways may complicate and/or delay a Section 38 road adoption agreement. Whilst we do not object to the discharge of this condition, the above comments should be noted as it may result in future adoption or planning complications. No comments on the other conditions listed above.

Subsequent comments following revised plans:

The slightly amended layout remains acceptable to the Highway Authority so our previous comments dated 24/01/22 (ref: SCC/CON/0222/22) still apply.

Floods and water

The following submitted documents have been reviewed and we recommend approval of the reserved matter application and a partial discharge condition 12 a) to f) only at this time:

- Planning Layout Ref BRA3 003 Rev C
- Soft Landscape Proposals 1 of 4 Ref LA5019 002 Rev E
- Soft Landscape Proposals 4 of 4 Ref LA5019 005 Rev E
- Drainage Strategy Ref 216203 P04

The points below detail the action required in order to overcome our current refusal: -

1. Submit a completed construction surface water management plan (item g) by the principal contractor a. It shall include.
 - i. Construction Surface Water Drainage System Design
 - ii. Construction Management, Maintenance and Remediation Schedules
 - iii. Required Consents (e.g. Land Drainage Act, Environmental Permit etc)
 - iv. Flood Risk Controls
 - v. Pollution, Water Quality & Emergency Control Measures
 - vi. Phasing Plan (if required)
 - vii. Construction Site Plan showing compounds, material storage areas, temporary site parking etc

Public Rights of Way

The proposed site does contain a public right of way (PROW): Bramford Public Footpath 34 and Bramford Public Footpath 35.

We have the following comments:

- We welcome Bramford Public Footpath 34 being set in a green corridor.
- However, where the estate road crosses Bramford Public Footpath 34 dropped curbs are required to ease movement across the road.
- In addition, the northern section of Bramford Public Footpath 34 between the path junction immediately east of plot 89, and where Bramford Public Footpath 34 meets the junction of Fitzgerald Road and Vicarage Lane, needs to be tarmac. This is to accommodate the significantly higher footfall the path will receive as a result of this development, with the obvious desire line being towards The Street in Bramford.

Officer note: the above comments have now been satisfied.

Fire and Rescue Service

The Suffolk Fire & Rescue Service do not need to comment on the Reserved Matters

Travel Officer

No comments

Suffolk Police - Designing out Crime Officer

- There are five flying freeholds incorporated at plots 1-2; plots 11-12; plots 13-14; plots 78-79 and plots 110-111. Flying freeholds are proven generators of crime, with no surveillance and they allow offenders easy access.
- It looks like a number of on plot parking spaces appear to be set back too far.
- There are two rear parking courtyards, along with a number of single plots that have rear parking incorporated. Rear parking is discouraged by police as these areas tend to have no surveillance and can place the fear of crime upon a vehicle.

- There are a number of parking spaces that are sighted too far to the side of their respective plots, which include plots 26, 32, 36, 58, 69, 82, 84. It is a documented fact that where parking spaces are either too far from respective properties or in short supply, such problems usually lead to antisocial behaviour, either from residents frustrated at not being able to park within their own living space, or from visitors.
- There are six alleys incorporated, which are a concern.
- It is good to note from the boundary plan that a number of vulnerable areas that could be used for unauthorised off-road parking will be prevented by post and rail.
- There is no post and rail indicated for around the Suds Basin area on the central southern side. It would be preferred if this area was also bordered off with something similar to post and rail.
- There is no lighting plan, so it is not known how the area will be lit? There are three main pedestrian walkways leading up from the southern area. Footpaths must have clear lines of sight and adequate luminescence at critical points, especially where paths connect in order to make users feel safe to use them and if there is to be any vegetation either side of these pathways, it needs to be low lying and regularly maintained to prevent offenders hiding behind them. All footpaths should be at least 3m wide to allow people to pass one another without infringing personal space and to accommodate passing wheelchairs, cycles and mobility scooters
- Where footpaths join existing roads, or other pathways, they need to be well lit in accordance with BS5489:2020 to provide reassurance that people will feel safe and not fearful of using such areas.
- There needs to be good security around the pumping station.

Internal Consultee Responses (Appendix 6)

Heritage

No comments

Environmental Protection – Land Contamination

No objections

Environmental Protection – Noise, odours etc

Recommend conditions

Environmental Protection – Air Quality

No objections

Environmental Protection – Sustainability

No comments

Public realm

No objection to this development as the level of open space and play provision is appropriate for this location. We welcome the natural grassland and native hedgerow choices. We would recommend that any new hedging is planted at a sufficient distance from garden fences so that householders have a maintenance strip between the hedge and their fence. This also prevents the hedge from damaging the fences as it grows.

Landscaping

Several points raised in our previous letter are still to be resolved, as listed below:

- Materials have now been specified for the circulatory footpaths, however we would recommend that the entirety of PROW 3156 should be the same material for continuity and to help direct the users along its length through the site.
- It is still our recommendation that where private gardens of plots abut the public realm and no external planting is provided to provide offset that these boundaries should be formed of 1.8m high walls. We recommend that the boundaries be reviewed and revised accordingly.
- We welcome the indicative section in the Drainage report, though would recommend that sections of this site are submitted showing the context of the basins. Furthermore proposed finished levels of the site are yet to be provided.
 - The previously raised point regarding tree lined streets has not been addressed.
- Details of inlets and outlets for the SuDS basins are still to be provided. We are still unable to support this application to discharge of Reserved Matters, Conditions 15 and 18.

Officer note: the above comments are bar comment two have now been satisfied.

Subsequent comments

Condition 15 Landscape Ecology Management plan, the submitted document focuses primarily on the maintenance of the site for ecological and biodiversity benefit in line with the condition wording. We have no landscape objections to the recommendations provided,

Landscape details in relation to the outstanding Reserved Matters and Condition 18. Unfortunately there is still insufficient information for us to fully assess the landscape scheme. Furthermore some of the previous recommendations which we believe are still relevant have not been fully addressed, including: - Walls for private boundaries which meet the Public Realm should be 1.8m walls. - Details of proposed levels have not been supplied. - Lack of street trees for secondary streets. - Identification of any areas of advanced landscaping is missing. - Alternatives to the heavily engineered SuDS basins have not been explored. - Details of inlets and outlets for the SuDS basins have not been provided.

The detail and design of the SuDS basins and swales should consider the rural location of the site. Currently the shape and profiles look to be very formal and engineered in appearance. We would recommend that these should be more organic in shape and profile, with the planting also used to create a more naturalistic appearance. The proposed trees should have less regimented spacings, mixed species and potentially introduce an understorey. If levels within the piped network allow, we recommend that the basins are created to a shallower depth or consider reprofiling the surrounding landscape to provide a softer edge, reduce the need for fencing and therefore integrate the features within the POS more fully. Some of the planting has been revised, which raises concerns over species suitability for location eg *Castanea sativa* is now proposed along the southern boundary, close to the SuDS basins and would not be suitable for this location as it requires well drained soils. We would also recommend further enhancement of the existing boundary planting to help filter the views of parcel B

Strategic Housing

Affordable housing is in line with the s.106 agreement
There is an over proportion of 4 and 5 bed dwellings
The affordable housing is not of a tenure-neutral design

Subsequent comments following revised plans.

Looking at the information that has been submitted by the applicant as of 03.05.22 it appears that the affordable houses mirror what was published in our response and agreed on 11th November 2021.

Looking at the latest submission the only change seems to be that the Flat over car port has been replaced with 2 x Houses - which we are in agreement with.

Ecology

We note that the Landscape Proposals – Rev F (IDP Landscape Ltd, April 2021) does not indicate that the provision of signage and dog waste bins. As a result, we recommend that an updated plan is submitted or that a prior to occupation condition is implemented to secure the finalised details, locations and maintenance of these features.

We also support the proposed soft landscaping for this development, as well as the planting schedule and specification that have been incorporated for this scheme. We are particularly pleased to see the provision of a wet attenuation basin, with an appropriate marginal planting mix for this feature. However, we do encourage the provision of shallow undulating sides on at least one side of the basin (e.g. max 1:3 slope), as well as uneven surfaces and convoluted edges to allow varied aquatic plant growth. This is recommended within the attenuation basin because this will provide the greatest habitat value, by providing optimal shelter, food and foraging and breeding opportunities for a variety of wildlife species, whilst also increasing the aesthetic of the SuDs feature.

Furthermore, we also support the aftercare of the soft landscaping plan, as outlined within the Landscape & Ecological Management Plan (IDP Landscape Ltd, December 2021). In addition, we support the submitted reasonable biodiversity enhancements, as contained within the Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy (IDP Landscape Ltd, October 2021). This includes appropriate locations, heights and orientations for bird, bat and insect boxes / integrated bricks, log piles, and hedgehog highways, as well as suitable installation and aftercare measures for these features. However, we do encourage the developer to have the finalised soft landscaping plans to be supported by a Biodiversity Gain Assessment.

It is highlighted that a wildlife friendly lighting scheme must also still be provided prior to occupation for this application (as required under condition 17 of the outline consent).

Other Comments

Mid Suffolk Disability Forum

Would like to see a commitment to ensuring that all dwellings will meet Part M4 of the Building Regulations in this planning application. All dwellings should be visitable and meet Part M4(1), and at least 50% of the dwellings should 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).

We note that some bungalows are to be provided and these should also meet Part M4(2) to assist people with mobility problems and to assist people who wish to downsize from larger dwellings.

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

Anglia Water

No comments

B: Representations

At the time of writing this report at least 6 letters/emails/online comments have been received. It is the officer opinion that this represents 6 objections and 2 general comment. A verbal update shall be provided as necessary.

Views are summarised below:-

- Lacking information but from details provided appears to be acceptable quality
- Inadequate provision of renewable energy proposals, no pv solar panels, no alternative to gas boilers Proposed dwellings to not provide alternative means for energy
- Not clear what the requirements for attenuation basins are
- Inadequate parking
- Excessive lighting
- Loss of greenfield land
- Dangerous access
- Not in a sustainable location
- Dwellings are too close to Fitzgerald Road
- Lack of healthcare for new residents
- Requires bat boxes, owl boxes and swift boxes
- Traffic calming required along Fitzgerald Road
- Lack of cycle links through and out of the development
- Lack of archaeological/ heritage desk based assessment
- Result in additional water runoff
- Result in additional traffic
- New dwellings will not comply with government regulations relating to energy efficiency and renewal energy

(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/19/01401

Outline Planning Application (some matters reserved)- Residential development of up to 115 dwellings and access, including open space and landscaping.

DECISION: GTD
02.09.2021

PART THREE – ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION

1. The Site and Surroundings

1.1 The application site comprises 9.08 hectares of agricultural land situated on the southern edge of Bramford (a Key Service Centre). The site forms the entirety of a field parcel, extending from the village edge south towards Sproughton. The site is located in the countryside as defined by Mid Suffolk Local Plan and Core Strategy at this time, but is allocated (Ipswich fringe) for 100 dwellings in the emerging Joint Local Plan.

1.2 The topography of the site is predominately flat, although there is a gentle decline towards the south towards river and commercial stables. In terms of ground cover, the site is relatively open to the centre with established hedgerows and trees to the periphery.

1.3 Fitzgerald Road (from which the site is proposed to be accessed) serves a number of mainly post war properties situated north of the site, which extends from an arterial vehicular highway known as the B1113 which flanks the site west. The site lies within the immediacy of existing development, with residential properties positioned to the north and north-east of the site. Residential units, stables and farmyard are also situated to the south.

1.4 The site is identified as being within Grade 2 and 3 agricultural land, divided centrally, and located west of the Gipping Special Landscape Area. The site is not in a vulnerable flood zone area and is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area, nor is it within or adjacent to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Site of Special Scientific Interest, Air Quality Management Area, Local Green Space, Area of Visual/Recreational Amenity, or any other land. The site is otherwise visually unconstrained.

2. The Proposal

2.1. The application seeks reserved matters planning permission for the appearance, layout, scale and landscaping for the erection of to 115 no. new dwellings on the site. This would consist of 75 no. market dwellings and 40 no. affordable dwellings.

The accommodation schedule would be as following:

Market dwellings:

2 bedroom: 25 (3 bungalows)

3 bedroom: 23

4 bedroom: 24

5 bedroom: 3

Affordable dwellings:

1 bedroom: 6 (4 flats)

2 bedroom: 22 (6 shared ownership) of which 3 will be bungalows

3 bedroom: 12 (5 shared ownership)

2.2 Following the deferral at Planning Committee, the developer has removed Plot 886 which was the two bedroom flat above garage and replaced this with a two bedroom two storey dwelling.

2.3 Parking spaces will be provided for the dwellings including spaces within garages, in addition there are 30 visitor parking spaces. The parking provision (including garages) is above that required in the Suffolk Parking Guidance. Following the deferral at Planning Committee, four of the triple tandem parking spaces have been removed, leaving 7 triple tandem parking spaces all off the secondary accesses.

2.4 The proposed materials for the development are principally red and buff bricks with some rendered and weatherboard elevations and red and black pantiles and fibre cement slate.

2.5 Access was approved at outline stage, with two accesses located off Fitzgerald Road to the West of the site. Footpath 3156 bisects the site, the layout shows this within a green corridor of public open space. There would be additional to other footpaths through the open space, including on the west of the site providing an alternative route close to the B1113.

2.6 A large area of public open space is proposed on the south west corner of the site which will include a local area of play. The attenuation basin would be located on the south east corner of the site.

2.7 The dwellings would be located in two blocks, the larger of which would contain 90 houses located on the north side of the site. The dwellings would be sited along the curved spine road and facing onto the open space and Fitzgerald Road. Two clusters of affordable dwellings would be provided in this section of the estate.

2.8 The small section of development would be to the south east of the site, comprising 25 dwellings including a cluster of affordable dwellings. Here the properties would overlook the public open space and the boundary of the site.

3. The Principle Of Development

3.1. The Principle of Development was determined with the granting of the outline planning consent under planning application no. DC/19/01401. The key test is whether the proposed appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of development responds appropriately to the character and amenity of the area, having regard to relevant guiding development plan policies. Considerations also include housing mix and affordable housing provision and layout.

4. Nearby Services and Connections Assessment Of Proposal

4.1. This matter was dealt with at Outline.

5. Site Access, Parking And Highway Safety Considerations

5.1. Site access / egress has been established by the grant of outline planning permission DC/19/01401. Parking will be provided in line with Suffolk Parking Standards.

5.2 A 2 metre wide footway will be provided to the front of the site, this will become a 3 metre wide cycle/footway between the access to the site and Lorraine Way where it will join the

proposed cycle way along Lorraine Way which this development, amongst others is funding. The Highway Authority consider that the internal roads within the site are suitable for cycling.

5.3 Following the deferral at planning committee the informal footpath parallel to Lorraine Way has been widened to 2 metres and provided with a self binding gravel finish, this will make it suitable for cycles. In addition the parking court to the rear of plots 22-29 has been removed and replaced with a new layout with a small parking court to the side of the side of plots 22-25.

6. Design And Layout [Impact On Street Scene]

6.1 Policy CS5 requires development to be of a high-quality design that respects the local distinctiveness and the built heritage of Mid Suffolk, enhancing the character and appearance of the district.

6.2 Policy H13 of the Local Plan requires new housing development to be expected to achieve a high standard of design and layout and be of a scale and density appropriate to the site and its surroundings, whilst Policy H15 of the Local Plan similarly requires new housing to be consistent with the pattern and form of development in the area and its setting.

6.3 Policy GP1 of the Local Plan states that proposals comprising poor design and layout will be refused, requiring proposals to meet a number of design criteria including maintenance or enhancement of the surroundings and use of compatible materials.

6.4. The development layout is generally consistent with the indicative layout considered at the time of the outline application. The generous amount of open space provides key views across the site, from the corner of Fitzgerald Road and Lorraine Way to the open countryside and the river gipping and from Lorraine Way to the St Mary the Virgin Church, Bramford.

6.5 The development layout also provides public open space on the southern section of the site, protecting the setting of the Grade II Runcton Farm located to the south of the site. The spine road through the site would be tree lined there would also be a hedge and trees along the boundary with Fitzgerald Road. The LEAP would be provided within the centre of the open space between the two sections of housing. This would allow the LEAP to be easily accessible from the development. It will also be located just off the public footpath, providing wider access to the LEAP.

6.6 The development will provide a mix of 2, 3 and 4 and 5 bedroom dwellings, both private and affordable. The development provides a reasonable amount of smaller dwelling of which there is a known need. The development is therefore considered to be in accordance with Paragraph 130 of the NPPF which states that development must provide appropriate amount and mix of development and Policy CS 9 of the Mid Suffolk Local Plan states that new housing development should provide a mix of house types, sizes and affordability to cater for different accommodation needs. The affordable dwellings all meet National Space Standards.

6.7 There will be three clusters of affordable dwellings, 11 social rented and shared ownership dwellings, include a two storey block of flats located on the east side of the spine road, 15 social rented dwellings in the centre of the site, diagonally opposite the first cluster, and 15 social rented and shared ownership dwellings in the South East corner of the site.

6.8 The dwellings are of a traditional design, with brick features. Following committee deferral, the non-functioning chimneys have been removed from the proposals. Although there are some examples of half boarding, which is not a traditional feature of Suffolk villages, this will provide some variety and is also used on other new developments within the vicinity, such that it is not considered to be out of keeping with the locality,

7. Landscape Impact, Trees, Ecology, Biodiversity And Protected Species

7.1. Existing boundary trees and hedges on the east, west, and south of the site would be retained and supplemented especially along the Western elevation. Additional landscaping in the form of a hedge and trees will be provided along the southern edge of the site, where it adjoins Fitzgerald Road. Within the public open space, new trees will be added. In addition street trees will be provided along the spine road.

7.2 Ecology, biodiversity and protected species were dealt with at outline stage. This application includes details to discharge conditions 15 Landscape and Ecology Management Plan and condition 16 Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy. The Ecological Management Plan and Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy are considered to be acceptable by Place Services Ecology.

8. Land Contamination, Flood Risk, Drainage and Waste

8.1 These details were considered at outline stage; Condition 19 of the outline planning application requires a land contamination assessment. Conditions 12 and 7 of the outline planning application covers Surface Water Management. The Flood and Water Officer has confirmed that Condition 12 can be partially discharged.

9. Heritage Issues [Including The Impact On The Character And Appearance Of The Conservation Area And On The Setting Of Neighbouring Listed Buildings]

9.1. The proposed layout closely follows the indicative layout provided for the outline application. The layout at outline was designed to retain the setting of the Grade II Runcton House, by not developing the southern part of the site and key views of the Grade I listed Church of St Mary. While the Heritage Officer has not commented on the reserved matters, the layout is considered to be acceptable from a Heritage consideration as it follows the advice given at outline stage.

10. Impact On Residential Amenity

10.1. The nearest neighbouring property are the dwellings located of the opposite side of Fitzgerald Road, the nearest of which would be located approximately 28metres from the proposed dwellings. To the front of the site is proposed a hedge and a footway. Although the outlook for the dwellings of Fitzgerald Road would radically change, the proposal is not considered to be detrimental to the amenity of the neighbouring properties.

10.2 The new dwellings will all have private amenity space. The layout of the individual dwellings will ensure that there is limited overlooking from the development.

11. Parish Council Comments

11.1 The majority of matters raised by Bramford Parish Council have been considered in the above report, but the following issues have also been raised:

- Cycle provision: A short section of cycle path from the development to Lorraine Way has been provided. The full application included a financial contribution, to be pooled with other development contributions to provide a cycle path along Lorraine Way between Bramford and Sproughton
- Footpaths: It is accepted that the Junction of PROW meeting Vicarage Lane lacks visibility, therefore an alternative footpath has been provided to Fitzgerald Road. It is proposed to have dropped curbs where the PROW meet the spine road and this has been accepted by the Highway Authority. The bulk of the dwellings are located prior to the road crossing for the PROW which will limit the number of cars using this element of the scheme.
- Plot 64 (886) the flat above garage has now been removed from the proposed layout.
- The play area would provide 7 different pieces of equipment which is considered acceptable for a development of 115 dwellings.
- Local tree species are now proposed. The public open space within the development is likely to be maintained by a private management company.
- Energy efficiency. Condition 21 of the outline application requires agreement of a scheme of water, energy and resource efficiency. Following committee deferral the developer has confirmed that all the dwellings will be provided with air source heat pumps and there will be no mains gas provided to the dwellings.

12. Discharge of Conditions

12.1 The application also includes details to discharge concurrently required details relating to Surface Water Drainage (Condition 12), Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Condition 15); Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy (Condition 16); Landscaping (Condition 18) and Housing Mix (Condition 22).

12.2 As stated within the body of the report the Flood and Water Officer is recommending approval of the reserved matters and partial discharge of the Surface Water Drainage details as the Construction Water Surface Water Management Plan has not yet been received. Place Services: Ecology have agreed to the Ecological Management and Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy. Details of Landscaping and Housing Mix have been provided and as set out in this report are considered acceptable.

PART FOUR – CONCLUSION

13. Planning Balance and Conclusion

13.1. The principle of the 115 dwelling development is established by the grant of outline planning permission. The quantum of development accords with the outline approval DC/19/01401.

13.2 There are elements of the scheme that are endorsed by Officers, which include: the retention of existing landscape features, protection of the setting of the listed buildings and view of the

church, location of the PROW within a green corridor the significant amount of public open space standard compliant affordable housing provision,

13.3 On the whole, the details submitted in support of the reserved matters application and conditions are deemed acceptable. Following the committee deferral, the plans have been revised to try to overcome the concerns of the Planning Committee. The reserved matters are recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION

That the application is GRANTED reserved matters planning permission and discharge of conditions 12 (partial), 15, 16, 18 and 22, subject to conditions as summarised below and those as may be deemed necessary by the Chief Planning Officer:

- Approved Plans (Plans submitted that form this application)
- Phasing Condition (To allow phasing of the development and allows spreading of payments under CIL)

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

- Pro active working statement