

Committee Report

Item No: 7B

Reference: DC/22/01274

Case Officer: Elizabeth Flood

Ward: Claydon & Barham.

Ward Member/s: Cllr David Penny and Cllr John Whitehead.

RECOMMENDATION – APPROVE RESERVE MATTERS PLANNING PERMISSION

Description of Development

Application for Approval of Reserved Matters following grant of Planning Permission DC/18/00861. Town and Country Planning Order 2015. Submission of Details of Appearance, Scale, Layout and Landscaping for the erection of up to 67No dwellings, public open space and supporting site infrastructure including access.

Location

Land To The East Of, Ely Road, Claydon, Suffolk

Expiry Date: 31/08/2022

Application Type: RES - Reserved Matters

Development Type: Major Small Scale - Dwellings

Applicant: Minster Property Group

Agent: Mr Jake Stentiford

Parish: Barham and Claydon (split across parishes)

Site Area: 3.37ha

Density of Development:

Gross Density (Total Site): 20 dwellings per hectare (DPH) Net Density (Developed Site, excluding open space and SuDs): 30 dph

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: No

PART ONE – REASON FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE

The application is referred to committee for the following reason/s:

It is a “Major” application for: - a residential land allocation for 15 or more dwellings

CLASSIFICATION: Official

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
CS06 - Services and Infrastructure
CS09 - Density and Mix
GP01 - Design and layout of development
H07 - Restricting housing development unrelated to needs of countryside
HB01 - Protection of historic buildings
HB07 - Protecting gardens and parkland of historic interest
HB14 - Ensuring archaeological remains are not destroyed
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
CL08 - Protecting wildlife habitats
CL09 - Recognised wildlife areas
CL11 - Retaining high quality agricultural land
T04 - Planning Obligations and highway infrastructure
T09 - Parking Standards
T10 - Highway Considerations in Development
T11 - Facilities for pedestrians and cyclists
T12 - Designing for people with disabilities
T13 - Bus Service
RT04 - Amenity open space and play areas within residential development
SC04 - Protection of groundwater supplies
H04- Proportion of Affordable Housing

Joint Local Plan

SP01 - Housing Needs
SP02 - Affordable Housing
SP03 - The sustainable location of new development
LP23 - Sustainable Construction and Design
LP27 - Flood risk and vulnerability
LP29 - Safe, Sustainable and Active Transport

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

[Click here to view Consultee Comments online](#)

Town/Parish Council

Claydon and Whitton Parish Council – Initial comments

Parish Councillors strongly object to the proposed changes brought forward at the Reserved Matters stage.

They were shocked at the difference between the original, approved plans and the new plans and felt that as there was so little in common, a new full planning application should be submitted.

In addition, councillors felt that as there had been a significant change in available amenities since the last application with the loss of a GP surgery in the village, there was even less reason for the original application to be approved.

The new design appears to have a focus on elderly and disabled residents. Whilst this would be encouraged in the village, as there is no GP surgery and the nearest surgeries are not connected easily via public transport and are over-subscribed, it would be an impractical alteration to the plan and have a very real detrimental impact on future residents in the village.

Councillors commented on the very linear, regimented layout of the new design and felt that it was significantly less attractive than the original, agreed layout, with a mix of housing styles. They felt that the new layout does not coordinate with the rest of the village, which has a more open plan layout.

Councillors welcomed the addition of part ownership to the plan, but were concerned about the ratio of part owned properties to affordable rented properties, as this is not detailed in the planning statement. Councillors feared that the new all affordable homes plan may create an enclave in the village and would not be conducive to integration into village life. Councillors also felt that a condition prioritising local people should be applied so that these properties would benefit people within the community.

There was a lack of clarity regarding the roads around the estate, what the surface would be and whether they would be one way. The original footpaths onto The Slade are also missing from the new plans.

Councillors were concerned about the amount of parking, as the previous plan included garages and parking and the new plans only include parking spaces. There was a question about where visitors would park and whether the narrow road would become blocked.

Additional comments

The parish council discussed these plans and concluded that they do not alleviate our concerns. This whole development plan should be withdrawn and a more suitable area closer to the facilities of a town, should be found. It is not suitable for more housing let alone social housing, where families will be in need of appropriate facilities. This is overdevelopment of a small site that is being built off another housing development(Exeter Road) that was built off another(Edinburgh Gardens). Both estates already have issues with traffic and parking, especially during the school runs, where it becomes highly dangerous, without adding another estate. We have the large development in Barham Church Lane coming soon, which will also have cars cutting through, to avoid a very busy Main Road, to get to the A14 and town. We have no doctors surgery, Needham Surgery is the closest and currently not accepting new patients. The schools are currently over subscribed. There is no regular bus service after 6pm and limited at weekends and only two small village food shops. This is a development for 67 social houses. These families will require cars to get their children to school, if they cannot get into the local schools (don't forget the 257 houses being built 500 meters away of which 100 are social housing). There is nothing for our teenagers to do (no bus service after 6pm) which could encourage anti-social behaviour due to boredom. Our pharmacy deals with a huge amount of medical enquiries, and like the doctors in Needham, complaints are increasing due to the demand and extra pressure being put on them. therefore the parish council feels that, to build social housing (or any more housing) on this plot of land, with the arguments that have been presented above, is irresponsible and thoughtless. There is also the the environmental impact of increased traffic, landscape impact and more destruction of habitats and open space. We are constantly discussing with the police the traffic issues that are in this area due to the over development of a small area

Barham Parish Council

Barham Parish Council is not happy with changing the design as this is not what was agreed at planning stage. The developers are again moving the goalposts to suit them and make more money and to make it all social housing. It is not acceptable and should remain as the original planning application that was approved.

National Consultee

Natural England

No objection. Based on the plans submitted, the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on designated sites.

Anglian water – initial comments

Anglian Water promotes the use of SuDS and on this site we would expect to see a full SuDS scheme, not the use of underground storage tanks. From looking at the site layout plan there appears to be ample room to accommodate above ground SuDs features

Subsequent comments

Raise no objection to the proposal, having reviewed the applicant's submitted surface water drainage information and consider that the impacts on Anglian Water's public surface water sewerage network are acceptable and have been adequately addressed at this stage.

County Council Responses

Highway Authority

Initial Comments

We remain concerned that plots 1 and 67 will suffer from frontage parking due to the location of the allocated parking and subsequently, the main access into the site may be regularly restricted by parked vehicles. The lack of route deviation or speed restraints between plot 32 and the bend past plot 13 also remains a concern and may result in high vehicle speeds. The applicant has had several opportunities to address these concerns and it now appears that they will not be addressed. Whilst we accept that we cannot maintain an objection on these matters, they should be noted and this may prevent or delay adoption of the estate roads under a Section 38 Agreement. Notwithstanding our above concerns, any planning permission should include conditions listed in the comments.

Subsequent comments

The amendments to plots 1 and 67 parking layout is welcomed and we are satisfied that the risk of parked vehicles obstructing the main access road has been minimised. The concerns related to potential vehicle speeds within the development remain and for this reason we repeat our previous comment regarding this potentially preventing or delaying adoption of the estate roads under a Section 38 Agreement.

Lead Local Flood Authority

Having received Drainage Strategy Ref 132-R001-V10, Proposed Site Layout Ref 21020 0102-P12, SuDS Design Assessment Ref 1132-R002-V1, and Email from GTC 24th March 2023 & 5th April 2024, recommendation is for approval.

Applicant needs to demonstrate to the LPA's satisfaction that the proposed surface water drainage system is to an adoptable standard i.e. Applicant would need to secure a s104 agreement under the Water Industry Act. All companies who are register by Ofwat would need to build the surface water drainage system in accordance with the Sewerage Sector Guidance and the Design Construction Guidance. LLFA would suggest that this is done via a pre commencement planning condition.

National Health Service

The proposal comprises a development of up to 67 residential dwellings, which is likely to have an impact of the NHS funding programme for the delivery of primary healthcare provision within this area and specifically within the health catchment of the development. The CCG would therefore expect these impacts to be fully assessed and mitigated by way of a developer contribution secured through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). In line with the Government's presumption for the planning system to deliver sustainable development and specific advice within the National Planning Policy Framework and the CIL Regulations, which provide for development contributions to be secured to mitigate a development's impact, a financial contribution is sought. This development is not of a size and nature that would attract a specific Section 106 planning obligation. Therefore, a proportion of the required funding for the provision of increased capacity by way of extension, refurbishment, reconfiguration or relocation servicing the residents of this development, would be sought from the CIL contributions collected by the District Council. Assuming the above is considered in conjunction with the current application process, Ipswich and East Suffolk CCG would not wish to raise an objection to the proposed development.

Travel Plans Team

No comments to make as the application is for less than 100 dwellings.

Minerals and Waste

No objection, subject to condition 25 from the outline being complied with.

Archaeology

No objection, subject to conditions (which were imposed on the outline permission).

Infrastructure

I refer to the proposal: application for approval of reserved matters following grant of planning permission DC/18/00861. Town and Country Planning Order 2015. Submission of details of appearance, scale, layout, and landscaping for the erection of up to 67no. dwellings, public open space, and supporting site infrastructure including access.

Consultation response letters dated 04 April 2022 and 04 October 2022 were previously submitted to the local planning authority, with the most recent letter time-limited to 03 April 2023. This letter updates and replaces the previous consultation responses.

There is a completed planning obligation dated 09 April 2021 attached to the outline planning permission under reference DC/18/00861/OUT. This Deed secures s106 contributions for the benefit of the county council in respect of education, highways, and public rights of way – and must be retained. Other infrastructure mitigation such as secondary school expansion, libraries etc. will fall to CIL.

I understand that the current proposal is for the scheme to be 100% affordable housing. In this connection, a Deed of Variation will be required. If the county council is to be a party to the DoV, then the applicant will need to cover the reasonable legal costs incurred by Suffolk Legal.

Internal Consultee Responses

Place Services Ecology

We support the mitigation within the reports however the reports are out of date and should be accompanied by an addendum. Developer should submit a Biodiversity Net Gain Plan to support the Landscape Proposals for this application. Advice provided on what to be included in the wildlife design scheme, to be submitted to satisfy a condition on the outlined.

Place Services Landscaping

Content that finer details can be secured through conditions however details regarding layout, street trees and SuDS should be resolved prior to approval of reserved matters.

Environmental Health Air Quality

No objection on the ground of air quality.

Environmental Health Noise/Odour/Smoke/Light

Confirmation required whether LEAP is at least 20m from the boundary of the nearest dwelling.

Environmental Health Land Contamination

No comments to make in regard to land contamination.

Waste Services

No objection subject to conditions.

Public Realm

Officers consider that the POS/play area aspect of the reserved matters has been met. Need to secure the local management solutions for the POS and play areas in perpetuity.

Strategic Housing

The inclusion of a small number of 4-bed homes, and a significant number of bungalows, is welcomed. It would have been preferable to have included some 1-bed units.

Via an update to the tenure plan and schedule of accommodation (new drawing number 0104-P10, submitted 28/03/23), the applicant has clarified the previous discrepancies related to unit sizes. This document records all units as being the correct size.

The applicant has proposed the following mix of tenures and unit types and sizes, as set out in the Tenure Plan submitted on 28 March. This mix is considered acceptable and the units sizes (floorspaces and bedrooms / occupants) are appropriate.

Mid Suffolk Disability Forum

The Mid Suffolk Disability Forum would like to ensure that there is a commitment 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 noted and welcomed that the bungalows are to be built to wheelchair standard Part M4(3).

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

No loose gravel, cobbles or uneven setts should be used

Climate Change Team

No objection to the proposal, subject to conditions.

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, 0 support and 0 general comment. A verbal update shall be provided as necessary.

Views are summarised below:-

- Affects local ecology/wildlife
- Building work
- design
- Development too high
- Dominating/overbearing
- Drainage
- Fear of crime
- Inadequate access
- Inadequate public transport provisions
- Increase danger of flooding
- Increase in anti-social behaviour
- Increase in pollution
- Increased traffic/highways issues
- Landscape impact
- Light pollution
- Loss of open space
- Loss outlook

- Loss of privacy
- Noise
- Out of character with the area
- Overlooking
- Over development of the site
- Residential amenity
- Scale
- Strain on existing community facilities

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

PLANNING HISTORY

REF: DC/18/00861	Outline Planning Application (with means of access to be considered) - Erection of up to 67 dwellings, public open space and supporting site infrastructure including access.	DECISION: GTD 23.04.2021
-------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------

PART THREE – ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION

1. The Site and Surroundings

1.1. The application site comprises (Grade 3) agricultural land on the eastern fringe of Claydon, which is designated as a Key Service Centre in the Core Strategy.

1.2. Claydon contains a number of services and facilities including a local convenience shop, primary school, secondary school and community/village hall.

1.3. The site is surrounded by residential development to the west and woodland to the east. The northern and southern boundaries contain hedgerows that form the field boundaries, with a further agricultural field to the north and rough grassland to the south. The site currently comprises two agricultural fields which are divided by a hedgerow. The site abuts the village settlement boundary on its western side. The site is within both parishes of Claydon and Barham, with the boundary of the parishes running along the retained hedge that traverses the site east to west.

1.4. The site is not highly visible from the wider area, but is visible from Church Lane to the north of the site, and from dwellings along Winchester Gardens, Ely Road and Hereford Drive.

1.5. The site is not in, adjoining or near any Conservation Area. There are no nearby listed buildings, the closest being the Grade I Church of St Mary's and St Peter's located on the north side of Church Lane some 280m northeast of the site. The Grade I St Peter's Church tower is

visible when viewing this application site from the surrounding area. The site is not in an area of special character designation such as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or Special Landscape Area, but is within the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) Impact Risk Zone. Nor is the site adjoining, or in proximity to, any designated landscape areas of special significance. The site is within the Mineral Consultation Area set by Suffolk County Council's Minerals Core Strategy 2008.

1.6. The site measures 3.37 ha and is located entirely in Flood Zone 1. Public Rights of Way run along the site's northern boundary (Bridleway 15052 linking Thornhill Road to The Slade) and the eastern boundary (Footpath 3553) running alongside the site through The Slade).

1.7. Ely Road is a cul-de-sac, although Winchester Gardens is accessed via Ely Road. Ely Road joins Thornhill Road to the west of the site. This road is currently a bus route for a regular service from Ipswich to Eye/Diss during the daytime on Mondays to Saturdays.

1.9. On the north boundary of the site is a protected oak tree (TPO ES61/T5) and a protected group of three oak trees to the north west of the site (ES61/G4).

1.10. To the north, outside of the site boundary, is a disused 19th Century chalk pit which has not been filled in.

2. The Proposal

2.1 The application is for reserved matters planning permission for 67 residential dwellings which would be 100% affordable with a mix of shared ownership and affordable rent, subject to application DC/22/06117.

2.2 The application seeks reserved matters planning permission for Appearance, Scale, Layout and Landscaping.

2.3 The layout is in line with the parameters plan agreed under the outline planning permission DC/18/00861 with bungalows on the western side of the site, adjacent to neighbouring properties and public open space surrounding the built development and at the centre of the site.

2.4 The layout provides two distinctive areas, divided by an area of public open space with a LEAP and the majority of the existing hedgerow. The northern part of the site provides 48 dwellings along a circular road and to the south is an area with separate access road which comprises 17 dwellings. An additional two dwellings are located at the entrance to the site.

2.5 The layout would mainly comprise semi-detached dwellings with some terraced properties and some detached bungalows and would consist of the following:

Affordable Rent: 42 properties

Shared Ownership: 25 properties

- 6 x 2 bedroom bungalow - 2 shared ownership, 4 affordable rent
- 5 x 3 bedroom bungalow – 1 shared ownership, 3 affordable rent
- 27 x 2 bedroom house – 13 shared ownership, 14 affordable rent

- 23 x 3 bedroom house – 7 shared ownership, 16 affordable rent
- 6 x 4 bedroom house – 2 shared ownership, 4 affordable rent

2.6 The majority of parking would be on private drives with one parking court at the southern end of the development.

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/18/00861. The key test is whether the proposed appearance, scale, layout and landscaping responds appropriately to the character and amenity of the area, having regard to relevant guiding development plan policies.

4. Nearby Services and Connections Assessment Of Proposal

4.1. The application site is close to a number of facilities in this relatively sustainable location on the edge of a Key Service Centre. 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/18/00861.

The access would be from Elm Road, which leads into Thornhill Road and to Claydon Primary School. Elm Road currently ends at the site and this road would be elongated into the site.

5.2. The Highway Authority has accepted the proposed parking and internal road layout but is concerned, by the lack of route deviation or speed restraints between plot 32 and the bend past plot 13 and may result in high vehicle speeds, SCC has stated that:

whilst we accept that we cannot maintain an objection on these matters, they should be noted and this may prevent or delay adoption of the estate roads under a Section 38 Agreement.

While a 93 metre straight length of road is not ideal, it is not considered that this would cause severe highway dangers and therefore would not be a reason for refusal of the application, in addition, experience of similar developments indicates that, despite on plot parking, it is likely that some on road parking will also occur which would narrow the road and lower speeds of vehicles.

6. Design And Layout [Impact On Street Scene]

6.1. The layout of the site is simpler, more urban and less organic than the indicative layout provided under DC/18/00861 with a circular road to the north and private drives to the south rather than a minor access road and then a number of private drives. The circular road layout to the north provides legibility and is a design which is featured in the housing estate to the west at Philips Road/ Eddowes Road. While potentially a less interesting design than that shown on the indicative layout it is considered acceptable. There will be public open space along three

sides of the circular road and opposite the dwellings to the south which will help to soften the development.

6.2 The house types have a simple design and are all similar in appearance, however the use of three different facing and roof materials combinations and five house types will add variety. Ely Road and Winchester Gardens also have a very standard design while Hereford Drive, a more modern development, has much more variety in house type. Given the context of surrounding development the design of the dwellings is considered acceptable.

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

7.1. There would be a significant amount of soft landscaping provided within the site, including on the boundaries of the site. Swales would be provided along the edge of the roads and two footpaths to The Slade public footpath would be provided. A large area of public open space with a play area is provided at the centre of the site. The Landscape Officer has objected to the overall layout of the development, but this is considered acceptable given the context, with similar estate layouts to the west. Street trees have been provided within the public open space as well as private front gardens and the suds basin has been removed. Overall, it is considered that the landscaping, subject to conditions is acceptable and the majority of the Landscape Officers objections have been dealt with.

7.2 The Ecological officer has expressed the following concerns:

- the ecological reports are out of date and should be accompanied by an addendum.
- Developer should submit a Biodiversity Net Gain Plan to support the Landscape Proposals for this application.
- Advice provided on what to be included in the wildlife design scheme, to be submitted to satisfy a condition on the outline.

7.3 The outline application includes the following condition (inter alia) :

All mitigation and enhancement measures and/or works shall be carried out in accordance with the details contained in the Great Crested Newt and Amphibian Survey (June 2018), Bat Detector Survey (July 2018), Badger Survey and Outline Mitigation Strategy (September 2018), Mitigation Strategy and Enhancement Plan (September 2018) as already submitted with the planning application and agreed in principle with the local planning authority prior to determination.

Further to this a scheme for the provision of swift boxes and hedgehog friendly fencing will be submitted to, and agreed in writing, with the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be carried out prior to first occupation of the dwellings to where the swift box or hedgehog friendly fencing are installed.

7.4 Given the above condition it is not considered that an up-to-date ecological report is required, as the application would have to comply with the reports set out in the condition.

7.3 Biodiversity Net Gain is not yet a requirement and therefore the development cannot be compelled to provide a Biodiversity Net Gain Plan. Further advice had been sought from the

agent regarding the wildlife design scheme with the request for additional biodiversity enhancements above that of swift boxes and hedgehog friendly fencing.

8. Land Contamination, Flood Risk, Drainage and Waste

8.1. Land contamination was dealt with at outline stage and is subject to conditions. The site is in flood zone 1 and therefore at low risk of flooding.

8.2 The proposals for surface water drainage include the use SUD's features; rain gardens and swales but due to the sloping nature of the site an attenuation basin is not considered practical and instead underground storage tanks would be used, including tanks under the LEAP.

8.3 While the flood and water officer has not objected to the proposals there are some concerns; Anglian Water have confirmed that they would not adopt such a SUDs system, and while the developer has stated that there is another water authority who will adopt the SUD this cannot be confirmed until planning permission is granted and the developer signs an agreement with the water authority.

8.4 Generally the fact that a SUDs system cannot be adopted is not a planning issue as it can be maintained by a management company and paid for by the occupiers of the development. However, while for an adopted SUDs system the maintenance fee is capped by the government and is a relatively small charge, private management company maintenance charges are uncapped and a tanked system can require expensive maintenance due to difficulties in access.

8.5 Should the SUDs system not be adopted in this case, the monthly maintenance charge (which could also include the roads if they remain unadopted and the public open space and play area) could be so significant that the dwellings would no longer fall into the category of affordable housing, in which case the dwellings would no longer be CIL exempt.

8.6 To protect the Council from this scenario, the following condition is proposed:

Prior to the commencement of development a detailed foul and surface water drainage scheme is to be submitted and shall be demonstrated to have secured technical approval under a S104 Agreement by a registered Water Authority. Should it not be possible to secure technical approval under a S.104 agreement by a registered Water Authority the developer will provide full details of the long term management and maintenance of the surface water drainage system including details of how the long term management and maintenance of the surface water drainage will be funded.

This would allow the Council to have an understanding of any potential service charges prior to construction and if this would mean that if the dwellings were no longer affordable (except those required under the s.106 to be affordable) then the Council could require a CIL charge.

8.7 The second issue is that the storage tanks are under the play area and if they need to be accessed for maintenance (potentially the storage tanks will have a 25 year life span) the whole play area would have to be dug up. It would be necessary to ensure that should this happen the

play area is reinstated. It is proposed to include such a requirement within a Deed of Variation for the s.106 agreement.

9. Impact On Residential Amenity

9.1. The layout of the development would protect the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties. The dwellings to the western boundary would be single storey and there would be a landscaping buffer to the dwellings on Hereford Way which face onto the site.

9.2 All the dwellings on the development would have small but private rear gardens and there is sufficient back to back and back to side distances to ensure privacy.

10. Planning Obligations / CIL (delete if not applicable)

10.1. As set out in the Committee Report for DC/22/06117, a 100% affordable housing scheme would be CIL exempt. A s.106 agreement which covered affordable housing, RAMS payment, funding for primary school building costs and land, public rights of way improvements, junction improvements and highway improvement to support pedestrians and cyclists was previously signed as part of the outline application.

11. Parish Council Comments

11.2 The majority of the Parish Council's comments relate to the principle of development of this site. However there is an outline planning permission for the development and therefore the principle has been accepted and cannot be reconsidered at Reserve Matters stage.

11.2 While the layout may be different to the indicative layout provided for the outline application, it complies with the parameters plan and is therefore in accordance with the outline planning application. The loss of the GP surgery from Claydon is unfortunate but would not be a reason to reconsider the principle of planning permission.

11.3 With regards to the concerns due to the lack of infrastructure, the development would help fund to a new primary school within Claydon which will help improve the existing lack of school places.

PART FOUR – CONCLUSION

12. Planning Balance and Conclusion

12.1. DC/22/06117 considered the principle of an 100% affordable housing development and its potential impact on community cohesion and CIL. This Reserved Matters application considers the reserved matters of layout, scale, appearance, and landscaping. The scale of development was considered at outline stage where an indicative plan showing 67 dwellings was approved.

12.2 The layout and appearance of the dwellings has been amended from those presented at outline stage, probably due to the change in tenure of the dwellings. However, the development is generally in keeping with the surrounding character of development and does have positive

aspects including generous landscaping, links to the PROW network and a large area of public open space with a generous play area which will be a benefit to the wider community. Overall the development is considered acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION

That authority be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer to GRANT RESERVED MATTERS PLANNING PERMISSION

(1) Subject to the prior agreement of a Deed of Variation for the Section 106 Planning Obligation on appropriate terms to the satisfaction of the Chief Planning Officer as summarised below and those as may be deemed necessary by the Chief Planning Officer to secure:

- **Ensure that previous s.106 payments are retained under a 100% affordable housing scheme**
- **Ensure reinstatement of play equipment should the play equipment need to be removed to access the SUDs tanks.**
- **Secure the local management solutions for the POS and play areas in perpetuity.**

(2) That the Chief Planning Officer be authorised to Grant Reserved Matters Planning Permission upon completion of the legal agreement subject to conditions as summarised below and those as may be deemed necessary by the Chief Planning Officer:

- **Approved plans**
- **Parking areas to be provided in accordance with the approved plans.**
- **Refuse/recycling areas to be provided in accordance with the approved plans.**
- **Details of adoption of SUD system.**

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

- **Pro active working statement**

(4) That in the event of the Planning obligations or requirements referred to in Resolution (1) above not being secured and/or not secured within 6 months that the Chief Planning Officer be authorised to refuse the application on appropriate grounds.

For reference list of conditions relating to the outline planning permission DC/18/00861:

- **Standard outline time limit**
- **Approval of reserved matters – appearance, scale, layout, landscaping**
- **Approved Plans – broad compliance with parameter plan including location of single storey dwellings**

- **Phasing Condition (To allow phasing of the development and allows spreading of payments under CIL) (Pre-commencement)**
- **Market housing mix prior to or concurrent with reserved matters to be agreed**
- **Removal of permitted development rights for upwards extensions to any single storey dwellings**
- **Provision of open space and play space, timing of and maintenance and management**
- **Detailed landscape planting plan, including advance planting, management plan, landscaping scheme and details of SUDS areas**
- **Road construction and surface water disposal from roads**
- **Construction management plan (including hours for deliveries and construction works on site)**
- **Vehicle turning and parking (including cycles and electric vehicle charging points)**
- **Bin storage**
- **Travel plan**
- **Protection of public right of way during construction the development**
- **Fire hydrants**
- **Drainage strategy (Anglian Water)**
- **Surface water drainage scheme including further infiltration testing and two-stage water treatment**
- **Maintenance and management of the surface water drainage scheme**
- **SuDS components on LLFA's Flood Risk Asset Register.**
- **Construction Surface Water Management Plan**
- **Mineral extraction quantified**
- **Archaeology – implementing programme of archaeological work**
- **Ecology protection, mitigation and enhancement, including the provision of Swift boxes, hedgehog fencing and wildlife sensitive lighting, walking routes**
- **Level access to enable wheelchair access for all dwellings/buildings**
- **Tree Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan compliance**
- **Unexpected contamination**
- **Energy and renewal integration scheme to be agreed**
- **Rainwater harvesting to be agreed**
- **Service ducting for Broadband cables**
- **No burning on site**