

## **Committee Report**

**Item No:** 1

**Reference:** 1636/16

**Case Officer:** Dylan Jones

**Ward:** Woolpit.

**Ward Member/s:** Cllr Jane Storey.

---

### **Description of Development**

Outline planning permission with all matters reserved except for access for the erection of up to 120 dwellings. Construction of a car park to be associated with Woolpit Health Centre. Access to the site and individual accesses to five self-build plots and associated open space. (Proposal includes highway improvements to Heath Road and Old Stowmarket Road, including double mini roundabout at The Street, Old Stowmarket Road and Heath Road junction).

### **Location**

Land South Of, Old Stowmarket Road, Woolpit,

**Parish:** Woolpit

**Site Area:** 6.52

**Conservation Area:** Site is not within the Conservation Area,

**Listed Building:** None

**Received:** 01/04/2016

**Expiry Date:** 02/07/2016. Extension to 30/09/2017

---

**Application Type:** OUT - Outline Planning Application

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

**Environmental Impact Assessment:** Environmental Assessment Not Required

**Applicant:** Pigeon (Woolpit) Ltd

**Agent:** Beacon Planning Ltd

---

### **DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED FOR CONSIDERATION**

The application, plans and documents submitted by the Applicant can be viewed online at [www.midsuffolk.gov.uk](http://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk). Alternatively a copy is available to view at the Mid Suffolk and Babergh District Council Offices.

---

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

---

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

Members may recall that this scheme was brought before the committee on the 3<sup>rd</sup> of August 2016 where it was resolved to be approved subject to the completion of a S106 agreement.

Since that committee, the County Council has advised other developers with schemes in Woolpit (which are also before this committee for consideration) that there will not be any capacity at the local school as this scheme has claimed the 25 spaces that were available, and that they will have to contribute towards the building of a brand new 420 place school. One of the other developers has pointed out that this scheme has yet to formally receive its planning permission and there could be potential that one of the other schemes could be completed before this one. As such, it would be unfair to allocate spaces against this scheme and request the other developers to pay a contribution towards a new school for that reason. Therefore, the reason as to why this case returns to the committee is so as the education provision aspect of this scheme can be reconsidered to provide a more equitable position with the other schemes that are currently before the Council in Woolpit. No other aspect of this scheme changes over what the committee considered favourably previously.

The above situation is complex, but it is considered that there is a way to ensure that this and the other schemes in Woolpit do not have a negative impact on education provision in the locality. It must be noted that the developer for this scheme has also presented the County Council with a further option in terms of education provision. They have been in negotiations over providing land to the rear of the existing primary school to allow it to be extended. Whilst that scheme has yet to be brought forward, it is important that it is considered in the determination of this and other applications in Woolpit as a potential future solution particularly as the County Council has indicated that it is their preference to expand the existing school over building a new one.

It is recommended that this scheme in terms of primary education is considered in this way:

1. Should this scheme be built first and uses the 25 places available at the local primary school – No contributions under CIL or S106 would be required for education purposes; or
2. If other schemes use the 25 available spaces first, then the developer for this proposal would be required to contribute a pro-rata payment of £363,880 towards the purchase of land and the provision of a primary new school; or
3. If the County Council has secured land for the expansion of the existing school and they decide that this is their preferred strategy for dealing with education, then the requirements for the provision of a new school falls away and the County will secure monies via a CIL bid for the extension. There will then be nothing extra for the developer to pay and the contribution towards the new school will not be collected, or will be returned if already paid by the developer.

The developer has agreed to the above as a way forwards to resolve the issues. This is considered to be a more equitable solution than previously proposed and this makes this scheme acceptable in infrastructure and planning terms.

**This scheme has been returned to the committee to solely resolve an education infrastructure issue. It is considered that this can be done via the methodology set out above. No other part of the proposal has changed, except for a slight relocation of the access position. As such, this case is again recommended for approval on the same grounds given in the original report which is revised below with an updated recommendation.**

---

---

## **PART TWO – APPLICATION BACKGROUND**

---

### **History**

There is no planning history relevant to the application site

### **All Policies Identified As Relevant**

The proposal has been assessed with regard to adopted development plan policies, the National Planning Policy Framework and all other material considerations. Highlighted local and national policies are listed below. Detailed assessment of policies in relation to the recommendation and issues highlighted in this case will be carried out within the assessment:

### **List of other relevant legislation**

- Human Rights Act 1998
- Town & Country Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990
- Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 (any rural site)
- The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010
- Localism Act
- Consideration has been given to the provisions of Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act, 1998, in the assessment of this application but the proposal does not raise any significant issues.

### **Details of any Pre Application Advice**

Pre application advice has been given on a number of occasions with regard to the principle of development of this site, both prior to and after the loss of the District's five year housing supply and with different interested parties. The application has not been submitted in agreement with the pre application advice given to this agent in terms of type of application approach, but otherwise as recommended by officers.

### **Consultations and Representations**

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

#### **A: Summary of Consultations**

---

#### **Woolpit Parish Council**

Woolpit Parish Council objects to the outline application for the following reasons:

1. Effective Traffic management has not been provided at the junction of Heath Road, Old Stowmarket Road, Church Street and Elmswell Road. A mini roundabout is required at this location. There are already substantial delays in accessing Heath Road/Elmswell Road from both Church Street and Old Stowmarket Road. Pigeon's assessment of vehicular usage at the junction at morning peak (8-

9am) is 906 and evening peak (5-6pm) is 852. This number of vehicles will cause congestion without traffic priority. In addition, the figures are incorrect and low as they do not take into account the additional vehicles created by school traffic using the new Health Centre car park.

The mini roundabout should be constructed before any site works commence.

Contrary to Policies T3, T4 and NPPF.

2. Safe cycling and pedestrian crossing facilities have not been incorporated into the changes at the above junction.

Contrary to policies H13, Cor6 and NPPF.

3. Segregated cycle tracks have not been provided both outside and within the site.

Heath Road is a designated lorry and bus route and is unsafe for cycling at the present time. It will be even more so with the additional vehicles the development will create.

The applicant quotes from DM21, one of the primary policies of the draft New Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan, which states:

"All developments should benefit from/enhance accessibility for sustainable modes of transport, by giving priority to pedestrian, cycling and public transport access to ensure they are safe, convenient and attractive, and linked to existing networks. Proposals for development shall, where appropriate, incorporate satisfactory and appropriate provision for:

- (i) Pedestrians, including disabled persons and those with impaired mobility;
- (ii) Cyclists, including routes, secure car parking and changing facilities where appropriate;
- (iii) Public transport and means that reduce dependency on private vehicles;
- (iv) Linkages to networks as appropriate including the development of new pedestrian and cycle paths.

Much mention is made in the applicant's Design and Access Statement of provision for cyclists but there is actually none in the proposal. Pigeon's Planning Design and Access Statement 3.11 states 'There is no formal cycle provision made within the immediate vicinity of the application site, however, given its character and location, it is considered reasonable that the local roads could be used safely by cyclists.'

Contrary to Policies H13, Cor6 and NPPF.

In addition, Councillors have the following concerns:

4. Legal pedestrian and cycle access through the Health Centre grounds should be confirmed.

5. There is only one access road into the development site. There should be a secondary emergency access.

6. MSDC should ask SCC Highways to consider a 20 mph speed limit from the Heath Road/Old Stowmarket Road/Church Street/Elmswell Road crossroads along Heath Road to the south side of the school site.

#### **MSDC Tree Officer**

No objection, trees proposed for removal of low amenity value.

#### **Natural England**

No Objection

#### **NHS England**

Need to mitigate for health care provision arising from development. (Note: Health care is identified on the 123 list for CIL and accordingly monies from CIL can be sought by NHS England).

## **Historic England**

Does not object to the principle of development, but seeks further assessment of impact of development on historic interests within the area. Any built up line to Stowmarket Road is pushed back and replaced with open space. (Note: This is an outline application and design and layout are reserved matters)

## **Suffolk Constabulary**

Promotion of secure by design and advisory guidance. (Note: This is an outline application and design and layout are reserved matters.)

## **SCC Archaeological Service**

Recommends archaeological works prior to determination of application.

## **SCC Rights of Way**

No objection

## **SCC Fire and Rescue Service**

Recommend fire hydrants to be installed, via condition.

## **SCC Flood And Water**

SCC are satisfied with the proposal and recommend a condition.

## **SCC Ecology**

Recommends conditions

## **Highways England**

No objection

## **MSDC Housing Enabling Officer**

No objections

## **B: Representations**

---

This is a summary of the representations both objection and supporting received.

- Traffic issues of Heath Road junction need to be addressed
- Will generate too much traffic
- Traffic issues of village centre will increase.
- Crossing roads is difficult now due to traffic
- Should be a roundabout a Old Stowmarket and Heath Road junction
- Children will drown in pond and should be made secure
- Additional water entering pond from development would be unacceptable
- Not adequate surface water assessment / flood risk of field
- Woolpit will lose character with so much growth

- Suggests modest phased development instead (10 per year for Woolpit)
- 120 homes too many / out of scale with village
- No capacity at school and concerns over routes to the school from development
- Increases pollution, noise and light pollution and risk to wildlife
- Access to self build on dangerous bend in road
- Surrounding roads and paths not wide enough to cope
- Need of consideration of noise from A14
- No concern for environment (lack of solar panels)
- Need for extra facilities first.
- Lack of Doctors, Shops and School/Lack of capacity.
- More residents may conflict with businesses in the area
- Houses if opposite could overlook us (Linden House)
- Out of character, size and feel of Woolpit.
- In sufficient employment to support more housing.
- Not sustainable development
- Opportunity to resolve some of the village's infrastructure concerns
- Supports affordable housing proposed
- Supports Health centre car park proposal
- Ideal location and no need for traffic through village centre
- Potential customers for village shops.
- May lead to increase pressure to resolve GP, broadband problems and employment in the area.
- Does not affect conservation area.

Other matters: Requests more land to be included to provide rear car park to school and resolve its problems. Preference over other potential sites and need for consideration of other potential proposed sites together. Need for bypass. Should be town development. Loss of view. Loss of house value. Need for completion time to avoid land banks.

---

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

---

From an assessment of relevant planning policy and guidance, representations received, the planning designations and other material issues the main planning considerations considered relevant to this case are set out including the reason/s for the decision, any alternative options considered and rejected. Where a decision is taken under a specific express authorisation, the names of any Member of the Council or local government body who has declared a conflict of interest are recorded.

There are a number of considerations which will be addressed as follows.

- Site and Proposal
- Principle of Development
- Planning Obligations
- Highway and Access Issues
- Design and Layout
- Conservation Area and its Conservation Appraisal
- Listed Building and setting / Heritage Asset
- Parish Plan/Neighbourhood Plan
- Residential Amenity
- Landscaping
- Biodiversity

## **1. SITE AND PROPOSAL**

### **1.1. Site**

The site is located to the east side of Woolpit. Woolpit is designated as a Key Service Area centre within the Core Strategy. The site itself has no designations within the Development Plan and lies outside the defined settlement boundary.

The site is an agricultural field.

**South Boundary:** This is an open boundary with the continuation of the field beyond for the most part. The exception being a mature copse to the centre of this boundary. This is shown to be capable of retention on the indicative plan.

**East Boundary (Southern end):** An irregular shape thin boundary of mature trees/hedge beyond which are further fields.

**East Boundary (Northern end):** A straight line boundary of more dense trees/hedge beyond which is a large pond/small lake (former clay pit) up to Old Stowmarket Road. This is in private ownership, but public access status is unclear given mix of signs on site stating both private property and advising not to drop litter.

**North Boundary:** A linear boundary along Old Stowmarket Road with scattered trees and open grass bank in part. This is where the main access is proposed. There is a paved footpath on the opposite side of this road, but not on the side the site is located.

**West Boundary (Northern end):** Rear of properties located in Saffron Close and includes dense mature trees and hedgerow.

**West Boundary (Southern end):** Rear of Health Centre. The boundary of the site is mature trees and shrubs that currently separates the site from the car park that wraps around the side and rear of the Health Centre. At the time of visiting site mid afternoon on a working day the car park was full and very busy.

### **1.2. Proposal**

Outline planning permission with all matters reserved except for access (1 main access and access for five plots, pedestrian accesses including via Health Centre) for up to 120 dwellings, car park to be associated with Health Centre. The proposal includes 35% affordable housing. The proposal includes potentially five self build plots, but for the purpose of this application these are regarded as market homes and considered without need for any additional material consideration.

Accordingly this application seeks to establish the principle of development. On this basis details such as appearance and siting are reserved, but an indicative plan is proposed to demonstrate that at least one approach to future development on this site can be achieved at reserved matters stage. While outline there are a handful of other certainties in this case for determination at this stage. Firstly the development is for a maximum of 120 dwellings. The type, height, number of bedrooms, number of storeys of the dwellings remain reserved, but reserved matters would not be for more than 120 dwellings. In this case the main access to serve 115 dwelling and five further drive accesses are not reserved and are proposed as part of this application. All the accesses are proposed to Old Stowmarket Road and these will be the same number and locations for any reserved matters application. Finally this development also proposes a 136 space car parking area for Woolpit Health Centre and more assurance around this is proposed by reason of a parameters plan that indicates the

siting and size of the car park. At the same time the parameters plan also provides that one area of the site is for bungalows.

The proposal represents 18.4 dwellings per ha and so is significantly less than policy CS9 (Core Strategy 2008) that seeks an average of 30 dwellings per ha where appropriate. In part this low density is due to the two large informal open space areas and provision of the proposed Health Centre car park demonstrated on the indicative plan. The development fails to meet the sought 30 dwellings per ha, but given the addition proposal of car park, potential extent of open space included and constraints of the site as a rural location, SUDs requirements and landscaping this is not considered a reason to warrant refusal on principle development grounds.

## **2. PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT**

2.1. At this time Mid Suffolk does not have a five year Housing Land Supply. The most recent published figures have demonstrated that there is a 3.3 year supply of Housing Land within the district. Relevant to this is Paragraph 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which states;

*"Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites." (para. 49)*

Paragraph 14 of the NPPF reads,

*"where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, granting permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted"*

The NPPF nevertheless requires that development be sustainable and that adverse impacts do not outweigh the benefits. The NPPF (paragraph 7) defines three dimensions to sustainable development- the economic role, social role and environmental role. These roles should not be considered in isolation. Paragraph 8 of the NPPF identifies that environmental, social and economic gains should be sought jointly. Therefore the Core Strategy Focus Review 2012 (post NPPF) policy FC1 and FC1.1 seeks to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area and proposal must conserve and enhance local character. Paragraph 55 of the NPPF sets out that to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. The proposal therefore must be determined with regard to sustainable development as defined by the NPPF .

The NPPF also provides (para 187) that *"Local planning authorities should look for solutions rather than problems, and decision-takers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible. Local planning authorities should work proactively with applicants to secure developments that improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area."*

Consequently policies CS1 and CS2 of the core strategy should not be considered to be up-to- date along with policies such as H7 of the Local Plan. On this basis residential development on the site should be considered on its own merits in accord with principles of sustainable development and improvements that can be achieved for the area.

## **3. PLANNING OBLIGATIONS**

3.1. CIL is now implemented and accordingly takes on board requirements such as open space contribution, NHS and education contributions.

The Health centre is confirmed to be at its capacity and no further development for the area its serves



can be supported. This is an extensive area that covers Elmswell, Thurston and Woolpit. On this basis the NHS has sought a contribution via CIL, but given the physical constraints of the Health Centre site there is no room for any expansion. Officers can not obtain any strategic plan from the NHS for its future growth and plans to development the health provision for this area. Accordingly there is a significant risk of unsustainable growth that can not be mitigated for in the future. The proposed solution in this case presented by the applicant is for the development to include a new car park for Woolpit Health Centre. This would in turn allow potential expansion of the current buildings onto the existing car park in the future and allows for expansion of capacity. Accordingly the provision of a car park has been agreed with NHS. This can not be secured via a Section 106 agreement given CIL is now in place, instead it shall be secured via planning condition and as infrastructure gain to be provided as part contribution to CIL.

Affordable Housing is not part of CIL and members policy to seek up to 35% remains in effect. Affordable Housing provision of 35% is proposed and recommended to be secured.

#### **4. HIGHWAY AND ACCESS ISSUES**

4.1. While an outline application, access has been included and refers to the following:-

- A main vehicular access with pedestrian foot ways serving the development, except for five plots, from Old Stowmarket Road.
- Five private drives serving five plots.
- Two pedestrian accesses to Old Stowmarket Road. These are located to the north east and north west corners of the site. The north west site pedestrian access leads first to an area of highways land before reaching the foot way and will need works across this area to create a link.
- One pedestrian access to the Woolpit Health Centre. This will need agreement with the owners of Woolpit Health Centre and accordingly may not be achieved and is not relied upon in the determination of this application.

The location of these accesses are set by the outline planning permission if approved. No objection to the accesses in terms of design and location have been made by SCC as highways authority and nor is there understood to have been objection to the level of traffic proposed. A positive formal response from highways is expected now details of improvements to the Health Road, Old Stowmarket Road and The Street junction have been submitted and will be reported to committee. It is not envisaged that highways matters will form a reason for refusal and the provision of a roundabout junction will improve safety locally.

#### **5. DESIGN AND LAYOUT**

5.1. Section 7 of the NPPF refers to design. It provides that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development; it should contribute positively to making places better for people. Decisions should aim to ensure that development will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, establish a strong sense of place, create attractive and comfortable places to live, work and visit, optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development, create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses and support local facilities and transport networks. Furthermore it provides that development should respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation. The NPPF goes on to state it is "proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness" (para 60) and permission should be "refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions" (para 64). In addition policy CS5 provides that "*All development will maintain and enhance the environment, including the historic environment, and retain the local distinctiveness of the area*" and echoes the provision of the NPPF.

The proposal is outline and both appearance and layout are reserved. While this is the case,

members should still be certain that a development can be demonstrated that would be unlikely to have any significant detriment on amenity or otherwise cause harm in order to judge the principle that such development can be achieved. The proposal includes an indicative plan on this basis and allows for clearer understanding that such a development or similar up to 120 dwellings can be carried out. Issues such as potential overlooking has been recognised and so bungalow development has been suggested. Reasonable open space is indicated and understanding of site constraints in terms of ecological and landscape interests are considered with the layout proposal. The indicative layout is considered to be of good design overall and while it may not be the layout implemented, proves there is not likely to be significant harm in principle and reserved matters is the appropriate stage to deal with layout and design.

Furthermore the development is for up to 120 dwellings meaning the figure is not set and options to reduce development to ensure appropriate layout can be dealt with at reserved matters stage if necessary.

## **6. CONSERVATION AREA AND ITS CONSERVATION APPRAISAL**

6.1. Woolpit has a Conservation Area and up to date appraisal. This site is not within the Conservation Area or considered to be adjacent as the site is to the east further down Old Stowmarket Road and a reasonable distance away from it. Views from or to the Conservation Area would be possible despite the distance given the Conservation Area covers a wide area that includes the junction of Old Stowmarket Road and section of field up to the Schedule Ancient Monument (SAM) Lady's Well. Given the distance and location in context it is considered that the development of this site would be unlikely to affect the setting of the Conservation significantly to warrant refusal. The siting and appearance of dwellings at reserved matters will need to take into account this setting, but this can be judged on its merits under the reserved matters.

## **7. LISTED BUILDING AND SETTING / HERITAGE ASSET**

7.1. Under the NPPF Para 17 states development should “*conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations*”. Para 131 goes on to provide that “*In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of; the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.*” Furthermore Para 132 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. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification.*”

In this case the reference can be given to both Lady's Well, a scheduled ancient monument and Woolpit church. There are potential views of both these heritage assets from the frontage of the site, but given the distance and relationship with roads and fields between it is not considered that the development would have significant impact and would be outweighed by the benefits of the scheme.

## **8. PARISH PLAN / NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

8.1. A Neighbourhood Plan designation was confirmed on 4th May 2016 and covers the Parish of Woolpit. At this time there are no policies associated with the plan and given the early stage little material weight is given to the Neighbourhood Plan. There is no village or parish plan.

## **9. RESIDENTIAL AMENITY**

9.1. Policies within the adopted development plan require, inter alia, that development does not materially or detrimentally affect the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. It is considered that this proposal does not give rise to any concerns of loss of neighbour amenity by reason of form and design that can not be dealt with at reserved matters stage.

## **10. LANDSCAPING**

10.1. The site is a field and within the countryside. On this basis there is impact on the wider landscape, but in this case the site is enclosed on almost three sides by the village of Woolpit and its built form. The site is more open to the south in part, however due to the terrain and form of Woolpit the extent of openness is limited. It is judged that suitable landscaping on site would be able to screen the site without too much trouble and the outline proposal demonstrates that open spaces can be located to the south and opportunity for landscaping is possible to be considered at reserved matters stage.

## **11. BIODIVERSITY**

11.1. Current discussions indicate that there is no significant harm to biodiversity interests that could not be allowed for within the site and conditioned as recommended. Protected species are close to this site have been considered and if further updates are necessary on this matter they will be made at committee.

## **12. SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL**

12.1. Woolpit is a key service centre and one of the more sustainable areas available to grow and take on the significant housing need the District has to address. Such areas will need to develop and potentially become new towns to serve the need and current gap in housing supply. The lack of a 5 year housing supply means little weight can give to policies that prevent housing on the outside of settlement boundaries, especially when dealing with a sustainable centre such as Woolpit. However, new housing should not poorly designed, harm the landscape, cause traffic issues that can not be mitigated or have other demonstrable adverse material impact. While within reasonable distance of the village centre to enjoy its facilities and within walking distance, the site is very much apart and its development is not considered likely to cause detriment to the character of Woolpit and its history or its conservation area. Details of actual design will be a matter for reserved matters. Traffic will increase in the area as a result of this development, but not to the extent that can be demonstrated to cause harm and unable to be mitigated against. The location of site is helpful in this respect as it is well related to the A14 and does not require traffic to go through the centre of village to reach this important piece of road infrastructure. At the same time if traffic was to go to the village centre it would be more likely to want to use and support the village facilities. While the development is not considered to cause significant harm on its own merits, it does provide additional benefit in the provision of a parking area that potentially improve traffic issues for Health Road that serves both Woolpit Health Centre and primary school. On balance the development provides a number of benefits, serves the housing need, provides affordable housing and parking, potential improvements to the health centre and road junctions and would be likely to mitigate any significant harm. On this basis the principle in terms of outline is recommended to be approved.

---

## **PART FOUR – CONCLUSION**

---

### **13. Statement Required By Article 35 Of The Town And Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015.**

13.1. When determining planning applications The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 requires Local Planning Authorities to explain how, in dealing with the application they have worked with the applicant to resolve any problems or issues arising. Continuous discussions have been carried out with the applicant throughout the application.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Corporate Manager - Growth & Sustainable Planning be authorised to Grant Planning Permission subject to the prior completion of a Section 106 or Undertaking on terms to their satisfaction to secure the following heads of terms

- 35% Affordable Housing
- The provision of on-site public open space
- Travel plan
- £363,880 towards the purchase of land and the provision of a new 420 place primary school

and that such permission be subject to the conditions as set out below

- Standard Time Limit Condition (Outline)
- Reserved Matters
- Approved Plans
- Construction Environmental Management Plan (Biodiversity) to be agreed (See ecology response)
- No removal of hedgerows, trees or shrubs or other vegetation suitable for nesting between 1st March and 31st August inclusive, unless a competent ecologist has undertaken a careful, detailed check of vegetation for active birds' nests immediately.(See ecology response)
- Landscape and Ecological Management Plan to be agreed (See ecology response)
- No external lighting shall be provided within a development area unless agreed by LPA.
- Provision of car park to serve Woolpit Health Centre with 136 minimum parking spaces and siting as shown on parameters plan to be provided in accordance with timetable to be agreed.
- Management of proposed car park to be agreed.
- Provision of pedestrian link to existing Woolpit Health Centre and car park to be agreed.
- No Vehicular link shall be established between the site and the existing Woolpit Health Centre and associated car park.
- Only single storey buildings shall be sited with the area indicated for bungalows on parameters plan
- Archaeology conditions as recommended by SCC
- Highways conditions as likely recommended by SCC
- SUDs condition as recommended by SCC (this requires amendments to secure a timetable for agreement and implementation)