

## **Committee Report**

**Item No: 6B**

**Reference: DC/21/02405**

**Case Officer: Daniel Cameron**

**Ward: North Cosford.**

**Ward Member/s:**

---

## **RECOMMENDATION – GRANT RESERVED MATTERS APPROVAL SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS**

---

### **Description of Development**

Application for approval of reserved matters following outline application B/15/01433 Town and Country Planning Order 2015 - Appearance, Scale, Layout and (Discharge of Condition 20 - Landscaping details) for the erection of 48No dwellings (including 17 affordable dwellings).

### **Location**

Land East of Artiss Close And, Rotheram Road, Bildeston, Suffolk

**Expiry Date: 28/01/2022**

**Application Type: RES - Reserved Matters**

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

**Applicant: c/o The Agent**

**Agent: Mr Joe D'Urso**

**Parish: Bildeston**

**Site Area: 3.1 hectares**

**Density of Development: 15.4 dwellings per hectare**

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

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

**Has the application been subject to Pre-Application Advice: Yes, (DC/21/01778)**

---

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

---

The application is referred to committee for the following reason:

Babergh District Council's scheme of delegation requires that applications which represent residential development for 15 or more dwellings be determined by Planning Committee.

---

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

---

### **Summary of Policies**

---

CLASSIFICATION: Official

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

### Babergh Core Strategy

CS01 - Applying the presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development in Babergh  
CS02 - Settlement Pattern Policy  
CS11 - Core and Hinterland Villages CS12 - Design and Construction Standards  
CS13 - Renewable / Low Carbon Energy  
CS14 - Green Infrastructure CS15 - Implementing Sustainable Development  
CS18 - Mix and Types of Dwellings  
CS19 - Affordable Homes

### Babergh Local Plan

CR07 - Landscaping Schemes  
CR08 - Hedgerows  
CN01 - Design Standards  
TP15 - Parking Standards - New Development

### Neighbourhood Plan Status

This application site is not within a Neighbourhood Plan Area.

### Consultations and Representations

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

#### A: Summary of Consultations

##### Parish Council

##### **Initial Bildeston Parish Council Comments Received 16<sup>th</sup> June 2021**

Bildeston Parish Council OBJECTS to the above application on the following grounds:

##### Housing Design

The proposed design of housing on the site is uniformly bland and uninteresting. There is nothing which echoes the architecture of the existing village or the materials traditional to the area. The houses give the impression of being larger or smaller versions of the same external design and so the overall impression is totally monotonous and characterless. Hence it exemplifies the worst in cost driven, mass-built housing which has no regard for local context.

Additionally, there is inadequate external storage for modern family living. None of the properties have garages. While garages are now seldom used for storing cars, they provide valuable storage for other things. The sheds proposed for each property are unlikely to be an adequate substitute, especially for larger family properties and therefore there is likely to be a proliferation of additional outbuildings after properties are built. It would be much preferable if adequate provision was made in the first place.

##### Surface Water Drainage

In our representations at previous stages of the planning process, we expressed serious concerns about surface water (and foul) drainage of the site and the potential to cause or aggravate flooding in the existing village. The representation for Suffolk County Council, as Lead Local Flood Authority, appears to show that these concerns were well founded and remain problematic to developing the site.

In particular, the risk of flooding to the existing village was addressed at outline stage through restricting outflow by limiting the size of the outfall pipe. Excess water was to be accommodated in an attenuation pond. The latest comments from SCC suggest that this strategy is fundamentally flawed. SCC indicates that the attenuation pond is expected to overtop during heavy rain and hence houses at the bottom of the site should not be built as proposed due to risk of flooding. The consequences are more serious and far reaching though. If there is uncontrolled discharge of water from the site through overtopping, then the flow of water into the brook is also uncontrolled. This then has serious downstream implications, including to properties which back onto the brook in Newberry Road, which have previously experienced flooding.

#### Pedestrian and Cycle Links to Village Centre

There remains no proposed direct pedestrian/cycle link to the village centre. This will encourage greater car use for short journeys and is totally counter to sustainability goals. Notwithstanding the outline permission granted; we would urge that a solution is now found to address this major shortcoming.

With this in mind, it is doubly disappointing to note that the developer is attempting to reduce the width of a new footway alongside Ipswich Road required by the outline permission, and has omitted one section altogether. We are pleased that SCC is robustly resisting this in its representation, and we would hope that Babergh will be equally robust. We trust that Babergh will give proper consideration to these issues, all of which have serious long term consequences for our community.

#### **Further Bildeston Parish Council Comments Received 14<sup>th</sup> July 2021**

We note the variations in materials and roof profiles now being proposed. While this relieves the uniformity in the previous proposals to an extent, the basic designs remain variations on a single theme and bear no relation to the indicative proposals in the outline application, where properties were more individual in character.

Our concerns about external storage remain.

We note that discussions are ongoing with Suffolk County Council (SCC) as lead local flood authority. Given the concerns about the risk of surface water discharge from the development causing flooding within the wider village, we would appreciate being kept informed as to whether SCC is eventually satisfied that the surface water discharge from the site can be fully controlled in all rainfall scenarios, removing the risk of overtopping of the attenuation basin.

We are also pleased to note that the layout now shows the full extent of the footway to be constructed alongside Ipswich Road and the confirmation that this will be 1.8 metres wide. This is, however, no substitute for a direct pedestrian (and possibly cycle) link from the development to the village centre. While we appreciate that outline permission was granted without such a link, we are disappointed that our offer in 2017 to help facilitate such a link was not taken up.

#### **National Consultee**

#### **Anglian Water Comments Received 7<sup>th</sup> May 2021**

##### Assets Affected

There are assets owned by Anglian Water or those subject to an adoption agreement within or close to the development boundary that may affect the layout of the site. Anglian Water would ask that the following text be included within your Notice should permission be granted.

Anglian Water has assets close to or crossing this site or there are assets subject to an adoption agreement. Therefore the site layout should take this into account and accommodate those assets within

either prospectively adoptable highways or public open space. If this is not practicable then the sewers will need to be diverted at the developers cost under Section 185 of the Water Industry Act 1991. or, in the case of apparatus under an adoption agreement, liaise with the owners of the apparatus. It should be noted that the diversion works should normally be completed before development can commence.

#### Foul Water

N/A

#### Surface Water

We have reviewed the applicant's submitted surface water drainage information (Flood Risk Assessment/Drainage Strategy) and have found that the proposed method of surface water discharge does not relate to an Anglian Water owned asset. As such, it is outside of our jurisdiction and we are unable to provide comments on the suitability of the surface water discharge. The Local Planning Authority should seek the advice of the Lead Local Flood Authority or the Internal Drainage Board. The Environment Agency should be consulted if the drainage system directly or indirectly involves the discharge of water into a watercourse. Should the proposed method of surface water management change to include interaction with Anglian Water operated assets, we would wish to be re-consulted to ensure that an effective surface water drainage strategy is prepared and implemented. A connection to the public surface water sewer may only be permitted once the requirements of the surface water hierarchy as detailed in Building Regulations Part H have been satisfied. This will include evidence of the percolation test logs and investigations in to discharging the flows to a watercourse proven to be unfeasible.

#### **East Suffolk Drainage Board Comments Received 14<sup>th</sup> May 2021**

No comments.

#### **Environment Agency Comments Received 13<sup>th</sup> May 2021**

No comments.

#### **Historic England Comments Received 4<sup>th</sup> May 2021**

Thank you for your letter of 23 April 2021 regarding the above application for planning permission. 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.

#### **Norwich Airport Comments Received 2<sup>nd</sup> May 2021**

Development will not present a significant collision risk to aircraft operating in the vicinity of Norwich Airport and does not lie within the bird circle shown on the aerodrome safeguarding map.

#### **County Council Responses**

##### **Development Contributions Comments Received 26<sup>th</sup> April 2021**

The outline planning permission under reference B/15/01433 has a Section 106 Agreement which SCC is a party to. The planning obligations secured under this reference must be retained.

##### **Fire and Rescue Team Comments Received 14<sup>th</sup> May 2021**

Condition 4 of the outline planning permission secures additional hydrants for firefighting purposes.

##### **Initial Floods and Water Team Comments Received 28<sup>th</sup> April 2021**

The applicant needs to clearly demonstrate that the proposed use of a pumped surface water system, which is contrary to national and local policy/guidance but agreed during the outline planning application

will be adopted by Anglian Water. This is to ensure that the costs to property owners for managed and maintenance of the surface water system are affordable. Ideally, the LLFA would still prefer to see a gravity outfall to the watercourse.

The applicant is also proposing to utilise a hybrid surface water drainage system, but they have not submitted any justification as to why a full above ground SuDS system cannot be utilised for collection, conveyance, storage and discharge.

There is also concern that the proposed location of the attenuation basin would put some of the new development at flood risk during flood events that exceed the design capacity of the basin. This is contrary to national and local policy/guidance.

#### **Further Floods and Water Team Comments Received 8<sup>th</sup> November 2021**

A further holding objection is necessary because it appears to be unclear between the surface water drainage system design drawings and the landscaping plan whether the attenuation basin has a permanent volume of water within the base. If the basin is to retain water for a pond feature this needs to be shown within the design drawings and the calculations. If the basin does not have a permanent waterbody, then the landscaping management plan need to be amended to show that pond maintenance isn't required.

N.B – This issue is not resolved at the present time; however, Members should note that as the issue between the applicant and the Floods and Water team is minor and relates to landscaping, not flood risk. As such a condition is considered an appropriate way in which to get the required information in this instance and has been applied to the recommendation at the end of this report.

#### **Initial Highway Authority Comments Received 26<sup>th</sup> May 2021**

The submitted layout details are not acceptable in highway terms for the following reasons:

1. The proposed access roads are designed at 6m width; this is excessive and may be reduced. The applicant should refer to the Suffolk Design Guide, SDG, for basic design principles here, 'minor access roads' being appropriate.
2. The turning head adjacent to Plot 42 is an excessive size and may be reduced to recommended dimensions within the SDG. As illustrated in the SDG there will need to be adoptable margins around the turning head where there are no footways.
3. The access road does not need to be widened outside Plot 1; it should be a constant width throughout, and the paved area reduced in size.
4. Similarly opposite Plot 8.
5. The main access road is excessively straight which is not conducive to low traffic speeds.
6. The main access visibility splays onto Ipswich Road should be shown. The splay to the west (into the village) at 4.5m x 90m should have the new footway positioned along the rear edge of the visibility splay.
7. The junction radius opposite Plot 1 and also opposite Plot 8 is excessive and should be reduced to 6m. This will reduce the size of paved areas.
8. Junction visibility splays need to be provided from the junction alongside the side of Plots 32/33 and 48.
9. Associated with this the car parking spaces alongside Plots 32/33 and 48 will likely obstruct visibility from this junction. In addition, parking spaces across the junction radius are not acceptable.
10. The general car parking strategy is not considered acceptable; it results in long lengths of dropped kerbing which is undesirable for pedestrians and wheelchair users to use. No garages appear to be associated with the 4 and 5 bedroom dwellings resulting in 3 parking spaces being provided across the complete frontages (Plots 6-8, 15-16, 17-20). The use of parallel parking spaces results in undesirable vehicle manoeuvring on/across the footway and make car parking unnecessarily

complicated and may result in footway obstructions (there is insufficient depth available throughout the frontages for 3 spaces parked perpendicular side by side)

11. It would be beneficial to label car parking allocations in order that visitor car parking space distribution can be assessed.
12. The parking area adjacent to Plots 34/35 appears tight for manoeuvring space.
13. There appears to be a large 'tarmac' area behind Plot 48, is this required?
14. The section of footway around the attenuation pond could probably be removed and replaced with a grass verge.
15. The proposed footpath link from the north east corner of the site would be better surfaced and more useable with a bound material rather than simply loose gravel.
16. There is a section of 'off site' footway missing on Rotheram Road; linking the Paddocks Way access and existing footway with Ipswich Road.
17. For information the Section 278 and Section 38 detailed drawings have not been considered or assessed. These will be considered once formal agreement applications are submitted, post approval of reserved matters. *However, it should be noted by the applicant and others that the new footway link along Ipswich Road, B1078, will not be accepted at a reduced width of 1.5m as now proposed. The new footway link should be 2m wide as discussed comprehensively during previous planning application consultations.*

### **Further Highway Authority Comments Received 19<sup>th</sup> November 2021**

Whilst the following comments do not form an objection (the proposal would be acceptable as a private development), the Highway Authority would not adopt the roads and footways within the development as proposed.

If the applicant intends this to be a private development, please advise and an amended response with recommended planning conditions will be provided.

1. The road width now appears to scale at less than 5 metres - please clarify the intended road width.
2. There are excessive lengths of dropped kerb throughout the development - the designer could consider shared surface roads to address some of this issue.
3. There are still excessive lengths of straight road despite the proposed speed restraints.

N.B – Members should be aware that matters relating to access and internal road organisation were approved at outline stage. As such, the only condition Officer's view as being reasonable to impose at this stage is one which requires the delivery of internal roads, footways and parking to each dwelling prior to its occupation. This is conditioned at the end of this report.

### **Travel Planning Officer Comments Received 26<sup>th</sup> April 2021**

No comments.

### **Internal Consultee Responses**

#### **Environmental Health – Air Quality Comments Received 10<sup>th</sup> May 2021**

No comments.

#### **Environmental Health – Sustainability Comments Received 13<sup>th</sup> May 2021**

No objections.

#### **Environmental Health – Sustainability Comments Received 10<sup>th</sup> May 2021**

It is requested that a condition to secure a scheme for water, energy and resource efficiency during construction and occupation of the development be submitted and agreed prior to development commencing.

N.B – Members should be aware that while such a condition would normally be applied by Officers as a matter of course now, at the time of approval of the outline permission, no such conditions was applied. It is considered that such a condition cannot be applied at this point given that the reserved matters relate solely to appearance, layout, landscaping and scale and this condition does not affect any of these considerations.

#### **Public Realm Comments Received 10<sup>th</sup> May 2021**

It is considered that the submitted details are sufficient and in line with the details secured under the outline planning permission.

#### **Initial Place Services – Ecology Comments Received 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2021**

Further ecological information is required prior to determination of the application.

#### **Further Place Services – Ecology Comments Received 15<sup>th</sup> September 2022**

A biodiversity net gain will not currently be delivered from the proposals. We still recommend that an off-site solution should be secured. Further information is required with regards to this aspect of the development. No issue is found with regards to landscaping on the site or with regards to the use of lighting within the scheme.

N.B – Members should be aware that outline permission has already been granted for this site with the required ecology conditions attached. Said conditions will need to be discharged as part of the normal process in order for the development to come forward. It is not considered that this represents an issue that would prevent the grant of reserved matters approval in this instance.

#### **Place Services - Heritage Comments Received 7<sup>th</sup> May 2021**

The application site lies within close proximity of Bildeston Conservation Area and a high number of listed buildings located within. The principle of development and layout has been agreed through outline application B/15/01433 and this application is to determine the appearance and scale.

In response to the refused outline application B/14/01435 (prior to permission being granted to B/15/01433) it was stated: *The Heritage Team considers that the proposal would not cause harm to any designated heritage asset because, although the development site lies within the settings of both the Parish Church and the conservation area, the specific contribution that the site makes to the significance of both of these assets is very limited, and the likely effect of the development on their significance will consequently be very slight.*

No heritage statement has been submitted for the reserved matters application. However, since the outline application (B/15/01433) was granted, local policy and national guidance has been updated. For example, Historic England's *Good Practice in Planning Advice Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets* (2nd Ed. 2017) and the Draft Joint Local Plan. Additionally, as the heritage officer had identified there is potential for slight impacts to significance of the Parish Church and Conservation Area, efforts should have been made to ensure that the proposal appropriately responds to the historic environment and any potential for impact has been mitigated through the design, scale, massing and materials.

Whilst limiting the development to 1-2 storeys is welcomed, the placement of the bungalows could be have been more considered to ensure that any potential for visual impact is reduced, for example at the north western edge. Variations in the roof forms could have also mitigated any visual impact whilst positively responding to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. A study of the Conservation Area would have informed this understanding.

The materials should be reflective of those found within the Conservation Area and identified within the Conservation Area Appraisal, such as 'Suffolk red' or 'Suffolk white' brick, render, timber-framed windows

and doors. Proposed materials have been outlined in the Street View - Plot 1-31 Drawing, however minimal detail has been provided.

Minimal information has been provided as such, the documentation does not meet the requirements of Paragraph 189 of the NPPF, as the potential impact to a number of assets cannot be determined. However, it is considered that provided minor amendments are made to the design and materials, the proposals will result in the setting of the Parish Church and Bildeston Conservation Area being preserved in line with Section 66 and Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Paragraph 193 of the NPPF should be considered as this gives great weight to the conservation of heritage assets. However, amendments will ensure that the potential of impact has been mitigated resulting in no harm to the significance of each designated heritage asset.

N.B – Amendment to the materials shown originally has been resolved by the applicant through the submission of revised documents.

#### **Place Services – Landscaping Comments Received 12<sup>th</sup> May 2021**

The amendments made are welcome. Additional detail regarding planting around the SUDS basin should be secured and a boundary treatment to the property frontages are expected.

#### **Place Services – Urban Design Comments Received 6<sup>th</sup> December 2021**

The submitted scheme should be reviewed and amended in a number of areas.

N.B – This work has been undertaken and the Parish Council comments now note no design objections to the scheme as before Members.

#### **Strategic Housing Team Comments Received 17<sup>th</sup> May 2021**

The proposed affordable housing mix is acceptable as is the 'pepper potting' of units across the site. Design, layout and parking provision is in keeping with the open market units.

### **Additional Consultee Responses**

#### **Suffolk Wildlife Trust Comments Received 14<sup>th</sup> May 2021**

Concerns are noted with regards to the outline details and the details brought forward now. These are similar to those of the Place Services – Ecology comments. Notes are made about integration of swift boxes and the hedgehog friendly fencing.

### **B: Representations**

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

Views are summarised below:

Objections to the scheme note the following material planning considerations:

- Size of scheme represents 10% growth on existing dwellings in Bildeston.
- Lack of integration to rest of village.
- Impact on local highways network and particularly impact of HGV traffic through villages to supply the site with building materials.
- Materials chosen do not reflect local character.

- Insufficient information on how development here affects neighbouring site at Rotherham Road and Artiss Close which are lower.
- Layout of the development is too formal and car dominated and restrict passive solar gain within site.
- Ecology impacts and lack of biodiversity enhancement.
- Flooding not satisfactorily dealt with.

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

## **PLANNING HISTORY**

<b>REF:</b> DC/19/05285	Discharge of Conditions Application for B/15/01433 - Condition 5 (Contamination), Condition 6 (Archaeological Works), Condition 28 (Part Discharge- Protected Species Mitigation Measures)	<b>DECISION:</b> PGR 02.04.2020
<b>REF:</b> DC/20/01643	Discharge of Conditions Application for B/15/01433- Condition 28 (Part Discharge- Protected Species Mitigation Measures)	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 18.05.2020
<b>REF:</b> DC/20/04666	Application for Non Material Amendment to Condition 9 relating to B/15/01433 - To allow for alterations to wording relating to footpath.	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 04.11.2020
<b>REF:</b> DC/20/04902	Application for the Modification of Section 106 Planning Obligation dated 19 October 2017 relating to B/15/01433 under sub-section 106A (1) (a)	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 11.12.2020
<b>REF:</b> DC/21/02405	Application for approval of reserved matters following outline application B/15/01433 Town and Country Planning Order 2015 - Appearance, Scale, Layout and (Discharge of Condition 20 - Landscaping details) for the erection of 48No dwellings (including 17 affordable dwellings).	<b>DECISION:</b> PCO
<b>REF:</b> B/16/00859	Application under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act (1990) to vary condition 29 attached to Planning Permission - B/15/1433/OUT (Outline - Erection of 48 residential dwellings with detailed consideration of access) - Prior to occupation of the dwellings the replacement of those parts of the frontage boundary hedge that are to be removed will be undertaken in accordance with the details shown on Smeeden Foreman plan reference LL01 dated 13 June 2016	<b>DECISION:</b> DIS 29.01.2018

<b>REF:</b> B/15/01433	Outline - Erection of 48 residential dwellings with detailed consideration of access.	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 20.10.2017
<b>REF:</b> B/14/01435	Outline - Erection of 49 residential dwellings with details of access, as amended by details received 23rd January 2015, 24th & 25 February 2015.	<b>DECISION:</b> REF 07.05.2015
<b>REF:</b> BIE/13/00949	Policy CS11 - Proposed Residential Development of up to 80 dwellings	<b>DECISION:</b> PCO
<b>REF:</b> B//02/01567	Application under Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1995 - Outline - Residential development ( for local needs housing).	<b>DECISION:</b> WDN 24.10.2002

---

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

---

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

- 1.1 The site is located to the east of Bildeston's settlement boundary, was previously utilised in arable cultivation and is currently laid to grass. The topography slopes from its south-east corner. The fall across the site is from 56 metres above ordnance datum (AOD) at the highest point in the south-eastern corner adjacent the B1078 to 44 metres AOD in the north-west corner. A stream (Bildeston Brook) is located to the north of the site.
- 1.2 To the immediate west is Artiss Close and residential development on Rotheram Road. Both developments are cul-de-sac estates layouts with properties backing onto the site. Artiss Close and Tailor Made Joinery across the road mark the current village entrance.
- 1.3 Bildeston's spatial character is one of an historic core with conservation area status with estate-style development set out to the east of this core. The village and its historic core retain a visual affinity with the countryside surrounding the village and its landscape setting, particularly to the west.
- 1.4 A public right of way runs north to south through the field to the east of the site, parallel to the eastern boundary. A public footpath runs along Bildeston Brook to the north and connection to this public right of way is secured through the outline planning permission.

### **2.0 The Proposal**

- 2.1 The application provides reserved matters details for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the erection of 48 no. dwellings including 17 affordable dwellings. Matters relating to access were fixed as part of the outline planning permission.
- 2.2 Access to the site is taken from the B1078, with internal roads creating a single spine road within the site except for a single private access. Dwellings are to take access directly from the spine road or from the private access. In the main, development faces inwards within the site, focused around an area of open space, although several dwellings face outwards onto the B1078.

2.3 The mix of market dwellings is as follows:

Number of bedrooms	Number within site
5 bed house	3
4 bed house	8
3 bed house	12
2 bed house	4
2 bed bungalow	4

2.4 While the mix of affordable dwellings is as follows:

Number of bedrooms	Number within site
2 bed house (AR)	3
2 bed house (Low Cost)	4
2 bed flat (AR)	4
1 bed flat (AR)	6

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

3.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that “If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise”.

3.2 The site for this proposal is on land that is currently unallocated for development, as defined in the adopted development plan. Therefore, its development for residential purposes is a departure from the current plan.

3.3 As Members are aware, the examination of the Council’s emerging Joint Local Plan (JLP) is currently paused, pending the submission of additional information. Within the emerging Joint Local Plan (JLP), this site does not form part of an overall residential land allocation for the village which is located to the south of Wattisham Road (ref. LA048). The settlement boundary of Bildeston is proposed to be altered to include the application site. Nevertheless, Members are advised that the weight that may be attached to JLP as part of the consideration of development proposals is limited at this stage.

3.4 Notwithstanding the above policy summary, in the case of the determination of this reserved matters proposal, it is considered that the outline planning permission that has been granted by the Council under application ref. B/15/01433 clearly establishes the acceptability of residential development taking place on the identified site for up to 48no. dwellings, and is the starting point for the decision-making process. Members are not tasked with re-considering the planning permission from scratch; rather, it is necessary to consider those details reserved under the planning permission for determination at this current stage of the overall process. The principle of development is therefore effectively fixed, subject to the conditions attached to the grant of outline planning permission.

3.5 In summary, the acceptability of the identified site to accept 48no. dwellings is established in principle and is the starting point for the determination of this reserved matters application.

### **4.0 Nearby Services and Connections Assessment of Proposal**

4.1 The application is located on the edge of Bildeston, a core village, as identified within Core Strategy policy CS2. Core villages are to act as a focus of development within their functional cluster and

are considered to have sufficient services and facilities to accommodate a degree of housing growth.

- 4.2 The application site is located around 500 metres from High Street up the B1078, putting future residents within a reasonable walking distance of most of the shops, public houses and the primary school. The application proposes the connection of the site to the footways within Bildeston in order to facilitate this. In addition, a footpath connection to the wider network of footpaths crossing the countryside is proposed and secured as part of the Section 106 attached to the outline of this application.
- 4.3 For reference, the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation (CIHT) Planning for Walking document states “Across Britain about 80 per cent of journeys shorter than one mile are made wholly on foot”. Furthermore, the CIHT guidelines for Providing Journeys on Foot set out desirable walking distances for journeys with acceptable distances of between 400 and 1000 metres, with the maximum of 1200 metres being suggested. The Department for Transport Local Walking and Cycling Infrastructure Plans Technical Guidance for Local Authorities sets out a core walking distance of 400 metres (approximately five minutes), with a 2km radius around this, extending the walking zone to 2.4km. It is considered that the site would offer a good level of connectivity to the rest of the village.

## **5.0 Site Access, Parking and Highway Safety Considerations**

- 5.1 Details of the access to the site were agreed at outline stage; however, the consultation with the Highway Authority notes that the access and its visibility splays are sufficient to be acceptable and that the only issues at hand are minor queries regarding the submitted documents. These relate to the width of internal roads, whether shared surfaces might be more appropriate for the site and that roads within the site appear too straight to naturally reduce speed within the development.
- 5.2 With regards to these queries, the width of the road meets adoptable highways standards and is measured as five metres in width. A shared surface approach might not be appropriate for this site given the traditional estate road layout of the adjacent site and road calming measures are noted within the scheme to reduce traffic speeds.
- 5.3 Policy TP15 requires that the layout of new developments will need to provide parking in line with the adopted parking standards. This is delivered within the site and further, it is noted that no triple-parking is proposed within the site.
- 5.4 Paragraph 111 of the NPPF confirms that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. No such impact is found with the application.

## **6.0 Design and Layout**

- 6.1 Policy CN01 sets out to ensure that all development is of appropriate scale, form, design and construction materials. Paragraph 130 of the NPPF seeks to achieve similar aims as does policy CS15.
- 6.2 The originally proposed layout is in accordance with the illustrative plans submitted at outline stage and retains the central area of open space with development. Revised plans have adapted and altered the proposed layout and design such that it is now considered to be acceptable.

- 6.3 The layout of the site proposed a crescent of development centred around an area of open space proposed to incorporate a central area of open space creating a focal point for the development and area for the residents to mix. Affordable housing is located as a group and while normally policy prefers a 'pepper-potting' of units within the site, discussion between the Strategic Housing Team and various RPs has noted that within a scheme of this scale, a concentration of affordable housing is preferable in that it provides benefits in terms of streamlining the maintenance of the dwellings. Housing is designed to be inward looking, however, given the position of the proposed development at the edge of the village and adjacent to the wider countryside, this is not particularly objectionable.
- 6.4 Housing is typically two-storey in height, matching the overall character of development in the surrounding area, although a number of bungalows are noted as well at key points within the scheme. The design of the proposed units are in one sense uniform, a key feature of a crescent development, and also individualised through use of materials. A mix of brick, render and weatherboarding is noted, all materials which can be seen within Bildeston itself and are considered to be acceptable within the context of the listed buildings and conservation area as well as in the immediate context of the surrounding development.
- 6.5 Vehicle movement within the site is, in the main, undertaken along a single spine road, with a secondary route providing access to the frontage development. Pedestrian movement from the site to Bildeston is achieved via improvement to the footpath running along the B1078 as well as through connection to the wider public footpath network and would provide access to the services and facilities of the village as well as the wider countryside.

## **7.0 Landscape Impact, Trees, Ecology, Biodiversity and Protected Species**

- 7.1 Core Strategy policy CS15 sets out a number of requirements for development to demonstrate. With regards to landscape, arboriculture, ecology and biodiversity impacts the following sections of the policy are relevant:
- i) *respect the landscape, landscape features, streetscape / townscape, heritage assets, important spaces and historic views;*
  - vii) *protect and enhance biodiversity,...*
  - x) *create green spaces and / or extend existing green infrastructure to provide opportunities for exercise and access to shady outdoor space within new developments, and increase the connectivity of habitats and the enhancement of biodiversity, and mitigate some of the impacts of climate change e.g. enhancement of natural cooling and reduction in the heat island effect, provision of pollution sequestration for the absorption of greenhouse gases,...*
- 7.2 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.
- 7.3 On-site vegetation is proposed to be retained and incorporated within the layout of the development. This is then to be enhanced further with additional planting within the site. Planting specifications have been subject to consideration by Place Services Ecology who confirm they are appropriate. Given the edge of settlement location of the site adjacent to open countryside, it is considered that a softer boundary approach is warranted. In views from the countryside, the site would be seen against the backdrop of existing residential development and would sit well in context.

7.4 Specific comments regarding wildlife impacts have also been taken from Place Services Ecology. They note that details regarding on site ecology are acceptable, as are on site biodiversity enhancements and lighting. They do note that off-site provision for additional biodiversity enhancement is required of the development, however, as noted earlier within this report, Officers do not feel this can be insisted upon and in any event, conditions attached to the outline grant of planning permission includes conditions to secure biodiversity enhancement within the site.

## **8.0 Land Contamination, Flood Risk, Drainage and Waste**

8.1 Core Strategy policy CS15 sets out a number of requirements for development to demonstrate. With regards to land contamination, flood risk, drainage and waste the following sections of the policy are relevant:

*vii) ensuring any risk of contamination is identified and adequately managed, and make efficient use of greenfield land and scarce resources;*

*xi) minimise the exposure of people and property to the risks of all sources of flooding by taking a sequential risk-based approach to development, and where appropriate, reduce overall flood risk and incorporate measures to manage and mitigate flood risk;*

*xii) minimise surface water run-off and incorporate sustainable drainage systems (SUDs) where appropriate;*

*xiii) minimise the demand for potable water in line with, or improving on government targets, and ensure there is no deterioration of the status of the water environment in terms of water quality, water quantity and physical characteristics;*

8.2 Land contamination was assessed at outline stage and found to be acceptable. There is no need to revisit this issue within this application.

8.3 Suffolk County Council, as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) confirms that the SUDS scheme approved at outline stage is acceptable. A query with regards to the SUDS basin within the site is noted; however, it is considered that this could be answered off with judicious use of planning conditions. The query itself relates to whether the SUDS basin is to be permanently wet then pond maintenance is required (and is currently set out within the landscaping details). If it is not, then no pond maintenance is required.

8.4 Anglian Water has capacity to accept the flows from this development site and no issue is noted with regards to its ability to deal with the flows. The Internal Drainage Board has no comments to make as the application would not affect its assets.

## **9.0 Heritage Issues**

9.1 Policy CN06 of the Local Plan seeks to protect the character and appearance of buildings of architectural or historic interest, particularly protecting the settings of Listed Buildings. Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving a listed building, its setting or other architectural or historic features from which it draws significance. Section 72 is also applicable; it requires that attention be given to whether the application preserves or enhances the character or appearance of a conservation area. In practice, a finding of harm to the historic fabric of a listed building, its setting or any special features it possesses gives rise to a presumption against the granting of planning permission.

- 9.2 The duty imposed by the Listed Buildings Act 1990 imposes a presumption against the grant of planning permission which causes harm to a heritage asset. A finding of harm, even less than substantial harm, to the setting of a listed building must be given “*considerable importance and weight*”. (\*Bath Society v Secretary of State for the Environment [1991] 1 W.L.R. 1303). While paragraph 199 of the NPPF further states “*When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be).*”
- 9.3 The Council’s Heritage Team was consulted on the outline application and noted that the site would have little impact on either the setting of the Parish Church within Bildeston or upon the Bildeston Conservation Area. Development is located adjacent to other modern residential estates, at the periphery of both the conservation area and the setting of the Parish Church. Consultation on this application with Historic England has not identified any issue with the application as it currently stands.
- 9.4 Specific comments from Place Services Heritage Officers was taken on the application and, while the application could have been more considered and been accompanied by a rationale to set out how the design choices shown within the scheme impacts on the heritage assets within Bildeston, there is no major objection to the proposed scheme noted. In particular, comments note that lack of detail on the materials proposed within the scheme. It is considered that a condition to secure this would not be required as the additional comments from Bildeston Parish Council notes no issue with the revised scheme.

## **10.0 Impact on Residential Amenity**

- 10.1 Paragraph 130 of the NPPF sets out a number of core planning principles which underpin decision-taking, including seeking to secure a high standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.
- 10.2 With regards to the site itself first, there is nothing within the submitted drawings that indicates that the proposed dwellings would be subject to a compromised degree of amenity by way of inadequate private amenity space or their relationship to each other. It is considered that they would enjoy a similar level of amenity that is currently enjoyed at the neighbouring estates and that the flatted dwellings to be provided within the scheme would also have access to shared private amenity space. Within the site, public amenity space set within the central area of open space is also noted.
- 10.3 Dwellings within the site are arranged in such a manner that it is not considered that adverse impacts would arise from the development by way of loss of natural light or overlooking. The neighbouring site is at a lower level than the application site; however, the use of bungalows at key points along that boundary means that no issues are created in terms of overlooking. Elsewhere, good back-to-back distances with the neighbouring site are noted and boundary planting is proposed to remain.

## **11.0 Planning Obligations / CIL**

- 11.1 A Section 106 Agreement is in place for the application site and secures contributions for education as well as open space and connections to the public footpath network.
- 11.2 Community Infrastructure Levy would be collected from the application site in addition to the infrastructure contributions secured under the Section 106.

## **12.0 Parish Council Comments**

- 12.1 Parish Council comments raise issues with the design of the scheme, surface water flood risk and pedestrian links to the rest of Bildeston. Amendments made to the application have resolved issues centred on design and accessibility such that no objection is noted on these grounds, however, their comments on surface water flood risk remain.
- 12.2 In this regard consultation with Anglian Water, the Internal Drainage Board and with the LLFA resulted in only minor queries being left to resolve with the LLFA. These revolve around the incorporation of landscape maintenance relating to the SuDS basin within the site and do not relate to the ability of the site to deal with issues of flooding or surface water drainage. It is considered that this issue has been resolved to a satisfactory manner and further, a condition is suggested to resolve this minor issue.
- 12.3 Comments relating to the change in width of the pedestrian connection to the rest of Bildeston are noted which now meets the requirements of the Parish Council. While an additional walking and cycling route to reach the centre of Bildeston would be advantageous, it is not considered necessary in planning terms given that this site connects in a satisfactory manner through the existing footway network and additional extension to the public footpath network is to be secured.

---

## **PART FOUR – CONCLUSION**

---

### **13.0 Planning Balance and Conclusion**

- 13.1 The principle of development on this site has been agreed through the approval of B/15/01433 and this application only relates to matters of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.
- 13.2 In this regard, the application is found to be acceptable. It would sit comfortably with the immediate surroundings of the site, which are modern estate developments. It is not directly read against the finer grain of development seen within the centre of Bildeston, particularly the Parish Church and the conservation area.
- 13.3 Some minor queries are noted within the consultee responses to the application, including with regards to ecological enhancement, landscape maintenance with regards to the SuDS basin and highway considerations within the site. It is considered that none of these queries represents an objection to the scheme, but rather an aspect on which there is insufficient detail, but which could be secured via the use of planning conditions. It is considered that this would allow the detail required to be secured without the need for further consultation or delay to the delivery of homes within the application.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

**That the Chief Planning Officer be authorised to APPROVE reserved matters subject to conditions as summarised below and those as may be deemed necessary by the Chief Planning Officer:**

- Confirmation as to the scope of the approval given and noting that the condition attached to the outline remain in force.
- Development to be undertaken in accordance with the approved drawings.
- Details regarding planting and maintenance requirements for SuDS basin to be agreed.
- Construction method statement to include details of HGV routing to site.

- Estate roads, footways and parking to be delivered prior to occupation within site.
- Additional enhancement measures including swift nest bricks and hedgehog friendly fencing to be agreed.

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

- Proactive working statement
- Notes regarding Anglian Water assets within the vicinity of the site.