

Forest Heath District Council

**DEVELOPMENT
CONTROL COMMITTEE**

4 NOVEMBER 2015

DEV/FH/15/047

Report of the Head of Planning and Growth

**PLANNING APPLICATION DC/14/2203/OUT – LAND ADJ COCK INN, BURY
ROAD, KENTFORD**

Synopsis:

Application under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and associated matters.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Committee determine the attached application and associated matters.

CONTACT OFFICER

Case Officer: Chris Rand
Email: chris.rand@westsuffolk.gov.uk
Telephone: 01284 757352

Committee Report

Date: 11th December **Expiry Date:** 12 March 2015
Registered: 2014

Case Officer: Chris Rand **Recommendation:** Approve
Parish: Kentford **Ward:** South

Proposal: Outline Planning Application DC/14/2203/OUT – Residential development of up to 34 dwellings together with associated roads paths and access to the public highway

Site: Land adj Cock Inn, Bury Road, Kentford

Applicant: Mr Michael Paske on behalf of Mr M Paske, Mr G Simpson & Messr's Greene King C/O Lacey Scott & Knight

Background:

This application is referred to the Development Control Committee due to its potential cumulative impact upon the village of Kentford when considered in conjunction with other planning applications.

The application is recommended for APPROVAL.

Proposal:

1. The application is in outline form and seeks planning permission for residential development (up to 34 dwellings).
2. The means of access only to the site forms part of the application. All other matters (details of scale, layout, appearance and landscaping) are reserved for consideration as part of any subsequent reserved matters applications.
3. The submitted plans indicate that the development would be served by a single vehicular access to be taken from the B1506 (Bury Road) to the north of the site.
4. Submitted for information purposes only is a draft block plan indicating how the applicant considers the site could be laid out with 34 dwellings.
5. As originally submitted, the application comprised an area of 1.73 hectares with an indicative capacity of up to 46 dwellings and a second vehicular access from Gazeley Road to the south east of the site.

Application Supporting Material:

6. Information submitted with the application as follows:
 - Application forms and drawings – including location plan. Design and Access Statement
 - Tree Survey
 - Flood Risk Assessment
 - Arboricultural Impact Assessment
 - Biodiversity Survey and Report
 - Environmental Statement
 - Heritage and Archaeological Assessment
 - Environmental Desk Study

Site Details:

7. The application relates to a site of 1.5 hectares located to the south of Bury Road and west of Gazeley Road within the village of Kentford and can be divided into two distinct parts.
8. The northern part of the site, having frontage to Bury Road comprises part of the car park and garden of The Kentford Public House (also referred to as The Cock Public House), a Grade 2 listed building. The proposed access to the site would cross the western end of the car park, which currently accommodates a garage building and communal bottle banks. The garden to the public house sits in an elevated position to the rear of the car park and contains a number of former orchard trees and sycamore trees. To the west of this parcel of land are two residential properties having a tandem relationship, one behind the other with access from Bury Road.
9. To the south of the garden to the Public House and separated by a line of trees is the second parcel of land, which is currently accessed from Gazeley Road to the east via a driveway which runs between Merman House and Regal Lodge. This area has the appearance of pasture, being laid to grass with an open fronted agricultural building located close to the northern boundary. Located within this part of the site and close to the eastern boundary are three residential bungalows of modest proportions and part of the garden of a property fronting Gazeley Road. This part of the site is enclosed on all sides by mature belts of trees which overhang the boundaries.
10. Adjoining the southern area, to the south and west are paddocks associated with Meddler Stud. The eastern boundary is adjoined by residential properties accessed from Gazeley Road.
11. Trees both within and around the site are protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO No.2. 2015).

Planning History:

12. None directly relevant to the whole site, but applications have been made in respect of parts of the site as follows.
13. F/2013/0191/OUT – Outline application for the erection of 3 dwellings to replace existing three dwellings (within parcel 2 identified above) – Approved.
14. F/2008/0147/FUL – Erection of 12 accommodation rooms with ensuite facilities, alterations to car park and access (within curtilage of Public House) – Approved on appeal. Not implemented.
15. Members are asked to note that there have been several proposals for development in Kentford over the last two years, as summarised below:

PROPOSAL SITE	SIZE	STATUS	REFERENCE
Kentford Lodge	60 dwellings	Approved June 2015	F/2013/0061/HYB
Gazeley Road	90 dwellings	Refused March 2014	F/2013/0221/FUL
Jeddah Way	16 dwellings	Approved November 2014	F/2013/0355/FUL
Meddler Stud	102 dwellings	Refused December 2012. Public inquiry September 2013. Appeal dismissed November 2013.	F/2012/0766/OUT
Meddler Stud	64 dwellings	Refused January 2015. Appeal submitted June 2015. Public Inquiry to be held March 2016.	DC/14/0585/OUT
Animal Health Trust	41 dwellings	Approved November 2014	F/2014/0692/FUL

Consultations:

16. West Suffolk Strategic Housing: The Strategic Housing Team supports the application in principle. Forest Heath Core Strategy Policy CS9 requires 30% Affordable Housing. Discussions will be required to determine the affordable housing mix for the site.
17. West Suffolk Conservation: Comments that the extent of the site leaves sufficient distance between the listed building and its setting to ensure that the setting of the listed building is not harmed. Recommends that conditions relating to boundary treatments be attached to any permission granted.
18. West Suffolk Environmental Health: Recommends that a condition relating to investigation and remediation of any unexpected contamination be attached to any permission granted.
19. West Suffolk Public Health and Housing: Recommends that conditions relating to construction hours and burning of waste be attached to any permission granted.
20. West Suffolk Ecology and Landscape:

The officer has carried out a Habitats Regulation Assessment and concluded that the proposal will not have a likely significant effect on any European sites, and can therefore be screened out from any requirement for further assessment.

Landscape

This is an outline planning application however there is no indicative layout.

The layout will need to have regard to the existing trees which form mature landscape features (woodland, small orchard and mature tree lines) that contribute to the landscape quality of the village. Of particular landscape amenity value is the open space to the rear of the public house and the backdrop to this provided by the mature trees. This should be retained as public open space. Any SUDs provision should be properly integrated into the design such that it does not compromise the retention of trees or the provision of adequate public open space.

Trees

The application is supported by a tree survey which locates the existing trees and reports on their condition. Tree removal is not quantified for the amended scheme. The layout when it comes forward will need to retain the trees on the boundaries of the site which make a contribution to the sylvian character of this part of the village and will be important in screening this site from the wider countryside. Any tree loss will need to be mitigated and a landscaping scheme will be required to demonstrate how this will be done.

In addition the scheme must be designed to avoid post development tree losses as a result of new resident resentment.

Tree impact assessment and protection information will need to be updated.

Biodiversity

The application is supported by a biodiversity report (September 2014). This highlights that the site has the potential to impact on bats through disturbance to bats and their roosting sites (in demolishing the existing buildings) and the removal of trees. A further bat survey (August 2015) has been provided and the main findings of this survey are:

- A single adult male brown long-eared bat (*Plecotus auritus*) was found roosting within the roof space of one of the buildings confirming the presence of this species.
- Evidence of Pipistrelle bats, as identified during the initial survey of September 2014, was found within a second building
- Without any mitigation measures, the proposed demolition of the two buildings is likely to result in the disturbance of bats and the loss of bat roosting sites.
- No features likely to be used by bats were noted on any of the trees inspected although, due to their position and the presence of foliage, it was not possible to get a complete and all round view of these.

A development licence issued by Natural England is required to legally carry out any proposed demolition of the two buildings found to be used by bats. The consideration for the LPA is whether consent would offend against Article 12(1) of the Habitats Directive and in doing so the LPA must decide if the application would be likely to receive a licence.

The key principles of licensing are:

1. There is a genuine need and a 'purpose' for the proposed activity.
2. There are no satisfactory alternatives to delivering and meeting the need in the way proposed.
3. The licensed action will allow the need to be met.
4. That the proposals are proportionate.
5. That there will be no adverse effect on the conservation status of the species concerned.

The proposals will not result in adverse effects on the conservation status of the species of concern. Briefly with regard to the further points and considering the information currently available: there is an established need for housing in the District and if the principal of securing houses on this site is acceptable there would be no reasonable alternative as the existing bungalows are of a poor standard; the proposals are proportionate and will allow the need to be met.

It is recommended that the layout of the site which is a 'reserved matter' will need to be supported by further evidence and mitigation in relation to the impact of the proposals on bats - in particular relating to any trees which are to be removed and how the effects of the scheme lighting can

be minimised.

Appropriate bat mitigation and compensation measures are suggested in the report for works affecting the buildings, including the provision of replacement bat roosting sites within new buildings at the site. The details of these will need to be submitted along with any further mitigation measures found to be necessary.

The recommendations in the protected species scoping report (September 2014) will need to be implemented and the proposals should include enhancements for protected species.

21. Suffolk County Council Planning Obligations: Provides advice on a range of planning matters, including S106 developer contributions:
 - Primary Education – Contribution of £3,224 per dwelling sought in respect of primary school provision.
 - Secondary Education – No contribution sought.
 - Pre-school provision – Contribution of £18,273 sought.
 - Transport Issues – A public transport infrastructure contribution of £4,000 is sought. See separate SCC Highways consultation response.
 - Libraries – Contribution of £7,344 sought.
 - Waste – A waste minimisation and recycling strategy should be secured by planning condition.
 - Supported Housing – Encourage all homes to be built to 'Lifetime Homes' standard.
 - Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) SuDS should be incorporated into the development, in the interests of reducing flood risk, improving water quality and biodiversity/amenity benefits.
 - Fire Service – Fire hydrant provision should be covered by an appropriate condition (see separate SCC Fire and Rescue consultation response).
 - High Speed Broadband – All development should be equipped with high speed (fibre optic) broadband.

22. Suffolk County Council Highways: Recommends that conditions relating to access and visibility splays, design and provision of roads and footpaths, vehicle and cycle parking, bin storage and the means to prevent surface water draining onto the highway be attached to any permission granted. A public transport infrastructure contribution of £4,000 is sought. This would need to be secured through a S106 Obligation.

23. Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service: Recommends planning conditions relating to the implementation of an agreed programme of archaeological investigation and assessment.

24. Suffolk County Council Fire and Rescue Service: Provides information relating to access and water supplies and recommends a condition relating to the provision of fire hydrants.

25. Anglian Water: Provides information relating to capacity within the receiving system and requests an informative be attached to any permission granted.
26. Environment Agency: Recommends that conditions relating to contamination and surface water be attached to any permission granted.
27. Natural England: No objection. The development should not have a significant effect upon the Breckland Farmland Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) which forms part of the Breckland Special Protection Area (SPA), which are close to the site.

Representations:

28. Kentford Parish Council: Objects to the proposal for the following reasons:
 - No further decisions should be made before the 3 already approved village developments have been completed. The developments of Kennett Park, Animal Health Trust and Kentford Lodge total 118 houses. Their impact on the infrastructure of the village must be assessed and considered first to ensure we have achieved sustainable development with a symbiotic improvement of the supporting infrastructure, before any further commitments.
 - In addition, no decisions should be made before a fully completed Local Plan is in place.
 - It is not safe to add a junction on the Bury road at this position because of:
 - A high volume of traffic, which has increased rapidly over the last few years.

	Developers' figures – unknown date	Our figures May 2015	Increase
8-9 in morning	434	765 (with 24 lorries)	331 – 76%
5-6 in evening	515	856 9with 15 lorries)	341 – 66%

- A high percentage of heavy lorries, as a result of a lack of proper A11/A14 link.
- Poor control of speeding. Recent County Council surveys show an average 23.7% of traffic is over 5mph above the speed limit of 30 on Bury Road (1768 vehicles a day).
- Being close to the dangerous Herringswell/Gazeley road junctions. The sloping Give Way sign is testament to the most recent accidents in February this year, one which seriously injured a motorcyclist.
- The way the road rises at the church reducing visibility. Considering the speed of many drivers going well over 50 (210 vehicles in one week September 2014) – is this factored into the visibility at this point?
- The dangers implicit in all westbound A14 traffic coming through Kentford when the A14 road is closed.

- The flow of traffic at this junction being swelled by the close proximity of the pub car park, popular and often full at its present size.
 - Pedestrians and cyclists should not be encouraged to access local amenities via the Bury Road. To get to the Post Office, pedestrians will have to cross the Bury Road twice. The road is fast and busy. The Bury Road is also dangerous for cyclists. Most recently, on February 18th this year, a man received serious head injuries while cycling on the road.
29. Neighbours: Two letters of representation have been received to the scheme as revised, raising the following issues:
- In addition to the developments already approved within the village, the total number of houses will have doubled.
 - Primary schools are already over-subscribed.
 - The volume and speed of traffic on Bury Road is already dangerous. No development should be permitted until this issue has been addressed.
 - Reduction in the size of Public House car park will lead to parking on Bury Road and highway dangers.
 - Access onto Bury Road is blind.
 - Indicative layout does not reflect the ribbon character of Kentford.
 - Site is located outside settlement boundary.
 - Proposal will result in the loss of trees with further impact upon ecology of the area.
 - No details are provided of the proposed houses.
 - Overlooking, noise and disturbance.
 - Own property is not shown on submitted plans.
 - Would wish to see existing trees removed on boundary and replaced with 1.8m high wall.

A further four letters were received in respect of the scheme as originally submitted, raising many of the concerns outlined above.

Policy:

Development Plan

30. The Development Plan is comprised of the adopted policies of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (adopted May 2010) and the Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Joint Development Management Policies Document (adopted February 2015). In addition, there remain some saved policies of the Forest Heath Local Plan (adopted 1995) which have not been replaced by Core Strategy policies or the Development Management Document. The following Development Plan policies are applicable to the proposal:

Core Strategy:

31. The Core Strategy was the subject of a successful legal challenge following adoption. Various parts of the plan were affected by the High Court decision, with Policies CS1, CS7 and CS13 being partly quashed (sections deleted) and Section 3.6 deleted in its entirety. Reference is made to the following Core Strategy policies, in their rationalised form:

Visions

- **Vision 1** – Forest Heath
- **Vision 7** – Beck Row, Exning, Kentford, West Row

Spatial Objectives

- **H1** – Housing provision
- **H2** – Housing mix and design standard
- **H3** – Suitable housing and facilities
- **C1** – Retention and enhancement of key community facilities
- **C2** – Provision and maintenance of open space, play and sports facilities and access to the countryside
- **C4** – Historic built environment
- **ENV1** – Habitats and landscapes and improving biodiversity
- **ENV2** – Climate change and reduction of carbon emissions
- **ENV3** – Promotion of renewable energy and energy efficiency
- **ENV4** – Design and architectural quality respecting local distinctiveness
- **ENV5** – Designing out crime and anti-social behaviour
- **ENV6** – Reduction of waste to landfill
- **ENV7** – Achievement of sustainable communities by ensuring services and infrastructure are commensurate with new development
- **T1** – Location of new development where there are opportunities for sustainable travel
- **T3** – Supporting strategic transport improvements

Policies

- **Policy CS1:** Spatial Strategy
- **Policy CS2:** Natural Environment
- **Policy CS3:** Landscape Character and the Historic Environment
- **Policy CS4:** Reduce Emissions, Mitigate and Adapt to Future Climate Change.
- **Policy CS5:** Design Quality and Local Distinctiveness
- **Policy CS6:** Sustainable Economic Development and Tourism
- **Policy CS7:** Overall Housing Provision (sub-paragraph 1 only. Sub paragraphs 2,3, 4 and 5 were quashed by the Court Order)
- **Policy CS9:** Affordable Housing Provision
- **Policy CS10:** Sustainable Rural Communities
- **Policy CS13:** Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

Development Management Policies Document:

32. The following policies from the document are relevant to this planning application:

- **DM1** – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- **DM2** – Creating Places – Development Principles and Local Distinctiveness
- **DM3** – Masterplans
- **DM4** – Development Briefs

- **DM5** – Development in the Countryside
- **DM6** – Flooding and Sustainable Drainage
- **DM7** – Sustainable Design and Construction
- **DM10** – Impact of Development on Sites of Biodiversity and Geodiversity Interest
- **DM11** – Protected Species
- **DM12** – Mitigation, Enhancement, Management and Monitoring of Biodiversity
- **DM13** – Landscape Features
- **DM14** – Protecting and Enhancing Natural Resources, Minimising Pollution and Safeguarding from Hazards
- **DM15** – Listed Buildings
- **DM20** – Archaeology
- **DM22** – Residential Design
- **DM27** – Housing in the Countryside
- **DM41** – Community Facilities and Services
- **DM42** – Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities
- **DM44** – Rights of Way
- **DM45** – Transport Assessments and Travel Plans
- **DM46** – Parking Standards

Other Planning Policy:

Supplementary Planning Documents

33. The following Supplementary Planning Documents are relevant to this planning application:
- Joint Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (October 2013)
 - Open Space, Sport and Recreation Supplementary Planning Document (October 2011)

Emerging Development Plan Policy

34. With regard to emerging plans, the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') advises at Annex 1 that decision takers may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans (unless material considerations indicate otherwise) according to:
- The stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater weight that may be given);
 - The extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater weight that may be given); and
 - The degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater weight that may be given.

Single Issues Review and Site Allocations Documents:

35. The Single Issues Review and Site Allocations documents were agreed by the Local Plan Working group for consultation in June 2015. Public consultation commenced on 11 August 2015. On this basis, and in accordance with the advice offered in the Framework, they can be attributed limited weight in this decision.
36. Members are asked to note that, for the purposes of public consultation for the Site Allocations Document, no sites are being identified as 'preferred sites'. However, this initial draft 'allocation' should not be attributed any weight, given current uncertainties as to whether the site will actually be included in any later draft of the Plan that is submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for examination.

National Planning Policy and Guidance

37. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. [The National Planning Policy Framework](#) ('the Framework') is a material consideration for planning decisions and is relevant to the consideration of this application.
38. Paragraph 14 identifies the principle objective of the Framework:

"At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking. For decision taking this means:

- *Approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and*
- *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."*

39. This presumption in favour of sustainable development is further reinforced by advice within the Framework relating to decision-taking. Paragraph 186 of the Framework requires Local Planning Authorities to "approach decision taking in a positive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development". Paragraph 187 states 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." The relevant parts of the Framework are

discussed below in the officer comment section of this report.

40. The Government published its National Planning Practice Guidance in March 2014 following a comprehensive exercise to view and consolidate all existing planning guidance into one accessible, web-based resource. The guidance assists with interpretation about various planning issues, and advises on best practice and planning process. Relevant parts of the NPPG are discussed below in the Officer Comment section of this report.
41. Paragraph 14 of the NPPF advises that where Development Plan policies are out of date planning permission should be granted for sustainable development unless *'any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole or specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted.'*

Officer Comment:

42. The issues to be considered in the determination of the application are:
 - Principle of Development
 - Sustainable Transport/Impact upon the Highway Network
 - Impact upon the character of the area
 - Impact on Listed Building
 - Cumulative Impacts
 - Section 106 Planning Obligation Issues

Principle of Development

National Policy Context

43. Para. 47 of the NPPF states that to boost significantly the supply of housing, local planning authorities should use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area (as far as is consistent with policy), including identifying key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period.
44. Local Planning Authorities are also required to identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five-years worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5% (or a 20% buffer if there is evidence of a persistent under-delivery of new housing) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land.
45. The latest FHDC assessment of a five year supply of housing land was published in February 2015. This confirms that the Council is able to demonstrate a five-year supply of housing.
46. The application site is not one which was included within the five year land supply 'calculations' as one that could potentially deliver any dwellings, within the prescribed 5-year period, (2014-2019). For sites to be considered deliverable the NPPF states they should be available, suitable,

achievable and viable. Potential sites included those allocated for housing within the local plan, those with planning permission, and any known specific unallocated sites with potential to make a contribution to the 5 year supply. In Kentford a number of sites were included in this figure. The major sites are at the Animal Health Trust (41 houses), Kennett Park (16 houses) and Kentford Lodge (60 houses).

47. A key determining factor will therefore be if the proposal is considered sustainable in the context of the NPPF whilst also having regard to the policies set out in the Core Strategy and JDMPD given their more recent adoption.

Sustainable Development

48. The policies in para. 18 to 219 of the Framework, taken as a whole, constitute the Government's view of what sustainable development means in practice for the planning system. Para.7 sets out three dimensions to sustainable development:
 - i) economic (contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy),
 - ii) social (supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities) and,
 - iii) environmental (contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment;)
49. The Framework explains (paragraph 9) that in order to achieve sustainable development, economic, social and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system. It is Government policy that the planning system should play an active role in guiding development to sustainable solutions.

Development Plan Policy Context

50. Kentford is designated as a Primary Village within the Forest Heath Core Strategy (Policy CS1). Under this policy, limited housing growth to meet local housing needs is generally supported in principle. The subject application site relates to land which is predominantly outside of the defined settlement boundary of Kentford and as such is classified as countryside. The proposed residential development would therefore be contrary to retained policies within the Council's existing local development plan - including Policy 9.1 of the Saved Local Plan (which allows residential development in rural areas in only certain specific circumstances).
51. The surviving elements of Core Strategy Policy CS7 provided for 11,100 dwellings and associated infrastructure in the plan period (2001 – 2031). The policy also confirms the phasing of development to ensure appropriate infrastructure is provided. Policy CS13 states that the release of land for development will be dependent on there being sufficient capacity in the existing local infrastructure to meet the additional requirements from development.

52. The 'original' growth strategy in respect of the District's settlement hierarchy was found to be sound. This would suggest that Kentford has the environmental capacity to deliver the development proposal for up to 34 dwellings.
53. In terms of the potential environmental capacity of infrastructure in Kentford, it has been held at planning appeal that the 2009 Infrastructure and Environmental Capacity Assessment ('IECA report') represents the best available evidence.
54. The IECA report considers the environmental capacity of settlements in the District, and recognises the need for a mechanism to provide social, physical and environmental infrastructure to support growth. The report also considers settlement infrastructure tipping points which are utilised to evaluate potential impacts on infrastructure.
55. The IECA report identifies a range of capacity in Kentford of some 240-420 new dwellings in the plan period to 2031 (although this would be subject to significant infrastructure improvements in line with growth). This would suggest that there is environmental capacity to facilitate not only the quantum of development that is proposed by this planning application, but also the other residential developments that the planning authority has already permitted (subject to the completion of a Section 106 agreement) in Kentford: 60 dwellings at Kentford Lodge (F/2013/0061/HYB), 41 dwellings at the Animal Health Trust and 16 dwellings at Jeddah Way (F/2013/0355/FUL).
56. The IECA report suggests that, in broad terms capacity exists for the subject development. However, this is not to say that incremental infrastructure improvements/enhancements would not be required. Indeed, the Planning Inspector who considered the planning appeal in respect of the 2012 Meddler Stud planning application adjacent to the application site, was informed by the evidence contained in the IECA report. It was his conclusion that given the pressure upon existing facilities identified in the IECA report as being at tipping point, there is a need to plan infrastructure improvements through the local planning process.
57. In terms of specific infrastructure issues, officers acknowledge that at the time of the planning appeal relating to the 2012 Meddler Stud application, the IECA report was found to contain the most up-to-date information. However, given that the IECA report was written approximately 5 years ago, Officers are of the opinion that it can no longer be considered an accurate reflection of infrastructure provision within settlements.

Prematurity

58. This planning application has been submitted in advance of the Core Strategy Policy CS7 Single Issue Review and the Site Specific Allocations Document, which will determine future housing numbers and distribution within the District. The Council is currently consulting on a 'Single Issue Review' of the Core Strategy (housing distribution) prior to submission for

Examination. It has also begun the formal process of preparing a Site Allocations Development Plan document, both of which will subsequently form part of the Development Plan.

59. This raises concern that approval of this planning application would be premature - specifically that the development would prejudice the proper consideration of site options for development within Kentford - and that consideration of the application should await the adoption by the Council of an appropriate Local Policy Framework.
60. Officers note that in the context of the 2012 Meddler Stud appeal, the Planning Inspector made reference to policy guidance on prematurity contained within the 2005 document *'The Planning System: General Principles'*. Paragraphs 17 and 18 of this document state that a refusal of planning permission may be justifiable in some circumstances on the grounds of prematurity, where a Development Plan Document is being prepared or is under review, but has not been adopted. Such justifiable circumstances would be *'where a proposed development is so substantial, or where the community effect would be significant that granting planning permission could prejudice the DPD by predetermining decisions about the scale, location or phasing, of new development which are being addressed in the policy in the DPD...A proposal for development which has an impact on only a small area would rarely come into this category....Otherwise, refusal of planning permission on grounds of prematurity will not usually be justified...'*. *The Planning System: General Principles* document was cancelled by the publication of the National Planning Policy Guidance.
61. Policy guidance on prematurity is not addressed directly by the Framework. However, more recent advice about the approach the decision maker should take is set out in the National Planning Practice Guide which was published in March 2014. This states:

'Annex 1 of the National Planning Policy Framework explains how weight may be given to policies in emerging plans. However in the content of the Framework, and in particular the presumption in favour of sustainable development – arguments that an application is premature are unlikely to justify a refusal of planning permission other than where it is clear that the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, taking the policies in the Framework and any other material considerations into account. Such circumstances are likely, but not exclusively, to be limited to situations where both:

 - (a) the development proposed is so substantial, or its cumulative effect would be so significant, that to grant permission would undermine the plan-making process by predetermining decisions about the scale, location or phasing of new development that are central to an emerging Local Plan or Neighbourhood Planning; and*
 - (b) the emerging plan is at an advanced stage but it is not yet formally part of the development plan for the area.*

Refusal of planning permission on grounds of prematurity will seldom be justified where a draft Local Plan has yet to be submitted for examination, or in the case of a Neighbourhood Plan, before the end of the local planning authority publicity period. Where planning permission is refused on grounds of prematurity, the local planning authority will need to indicate clearly how the grant of permission for the development concerned would prejudice the outcome of the plan-making process’.

62. In the circumstances of this planning application, the development proposal of up to 34 dwellings is considered to represent a small proportion of growth, when compared with other planning approvals which have been issued by Forest Heath District Council ahead of the plan making process.
63. Officers acknowledge that each settlement has its own unique characteristic (for example infrastructure ‘tipping points’) that govern its ability to accommodate growth and at what stage. Moreover, this development proposal needs to be considered cumulatively - with committed residential development on the Kentford Lodge, Jeddah Way and Animal Health Trust sites (F/2013/0051/HYB, F/2013/0355/FUL and DC/14/0692/FUL respectively). The cumulative scale of development on these sites amounts to 171 dwellings.
64. Officers do not consider the cumulative scale of residential development proposed in Kentford to be substantial in comparison to the overall quantum of development to be provided across the District, over the Plan period. Furthermore, the emerging Single Issue Review of the Core Strategy is in its infancy and carries limited, if any, weight in the decision making process (given that it has only recently been published for consultation).
65. Given the context of the current guidance as outlined above, officers consider that it would be difficult to justify any decision that approval of this scheme would be premature.
66. On the basis of national guidance on the issue of prematurity, and relevant national policies providing for the delivery of sustainable development without delay, Officers do not consider it would be reasonable to object to the planning application on the grounds of it being premature to the Development Plan.

Summary

67. Despite the demonstration of a 5 year housing supply, the key determining factor will be whether the proposed development can be deemed ‘sustainable’ in the context of the policies contained in the Framework (as a whole). Even if it is concluded that the proposal would not be ‘unsustainable’ following analysis, further consideration must be given to whether the benefits of development outweigh its dis-benefits, as required by the Framework.

Sustainable Transport/Impact upon the Highway Network

68. National planning policy in relation to the transport planning of developments is set out in the Framework. Section 4, paragraphs 29 to 41 deal specifically with transport planning and the promotion of sustainable transport.
69. The Framework confirms that the transport system needs to be balanced in favour of sustainable transport modes, giving people a real choice about how they travel. Paragraph 32 of the Framework requires all developments that generate significant amounts of movements to be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. It goes on to advise that development should not be prevented or refused on transport grounds, unless the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.
70. Paragraph 34 of the Framework states that planning decisions should ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable modes of transport can be maximised. However the Framework recognises that different policies and measures will be required in different communities, and opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary from urban to rural areas.
71. Core Strategy Spatial Policy T1 aims to ensure that new development is located where there are the best opportunities for sustainable travel and the least dependency on car travel. This is reflected in Policies CS12 and CS13 which confirms the District Council will work with the partners (including developers) to secure necessary transport infrastructure and sustainable transport measures, and ensure that access and safety concerns are resolved in all developments. Spatial Objective T3 seeks to support strategic transport improvements serving Forest Heath, especially the A14 and A11 road and rail corridors, in order to minimise the adverse impacts of traffic on communities, improve safety, improve public transport facilities and ensure the sustainable development of the area is not constrained.
72. In the specific context of Kentford, the IECA report considers that the village has a reasonable road network, although acknowledges that the difficult access to Kentford railway station means that the majority of journeys from the village would be by car. The report identifies local highway works as 'fundamental and essential infrastructure' required for the level of growth associated with 500 new homes.

Access Arrangements

73. As originally submitted, the application proposed two access points, one to the north from Bury Road and one to the east from Gazeley Road. Following discussions with officers, the access from Gazeley Road has been deleted. The remaining access serving the development would be located on the western side of the existing car park which serves the Public House. At present, the car park to the public house is unmarked

and has two access points to Bury Road. The proposal would create a new access road located at the existing western access point to the car park. Access to the car park would then be taken from the new access road and the existing eastern access to the car park would be stopped up.

74. Although the new access road would reduce the size of the car park as it presently exists, it should be possible to increase capacity to compensate for the lost space. At present the car park is marked with parking bays and is partly taken up with a garage type building on the western boundary, where the access would be located. Stopping up the eastern access and marking the car park with parking bays could result in far more efficient use of the space available and increase capacity.
75. The Parish Council has raised significant concerns, backed by its own survey data, relating to the proposed access from Bury Road, with particular emphasis upon the sight visibility splays to the west. Although the road is relatively straight at this point, the concern relates primarily to the horizontal alignment of the road which falls away from the site and the speed of traffic using Bury Road.
76. The County Highways Engineer, has assessed the data provided by the Parish Council and reappraised its earlier responses. However, despite the concerns expressed no objection is raised to the proposed access arrangements, subject to the detail of the scheme being provided by way of planning condition, including the provision of visibility splays, should approval be forthcoming. Notwithstanding this conclusion, there are clearly issues within the village relating to the speed of traffic which require addressing. For this reason, the Engineer suggests that rather than contribute towards a cycle scheme, funding could be used for traffic calming measures.

Impact upon the character of the locality:

77. Policy DM2 (Creating Places – Development Principles and Local Distinctiveness), of the adopted Development Management Policies document seeks (inter alia) to promote sustainable development which recognises the key features and characteristics of a locality and maintains or creates a sense of place.
78. Policy DM22 relates to residential design and provides further specific advice and requirements to ensure good residential design which responds to its location and setting and creates a high quality environment.

Existing character

79. The existing pattern of development in this part of Kentford is essentially linear in character, with development fronting Bury Road and Gazeley Road. However, over the years small pockets of development with one or two properties in depth have taken place, often within the grounds of larger properties, although these are largely secluded and do not alter the linear character of the area. Another feature of this part of the village on the south side of Bury Road are the properties with large gardens which

provide space between buildings and contain a significant number of mature trees which contribute to the rural character of the village.

80. Bury Road is wide and straight and still reflects its former status from when it formed part of the A45 trunk road before the construction of the Newmarket by-pass (A14). Although A14 traffic has been removed, it still serves as a major access route into Newmarket.
81. A significant feature and landmark building in the locality is Grade 2 listed Kentford Public House, with its open car park and large garden area. This former Coaching Inn not only creates a focal feature within the village, but is also a community facility which contributes to the quality of the community life and helps to maintain a sustainable community. Although the Public House is located outside the application site, the site does include part of the car park and an element of the garden area.
82. Development on the western side of Gazeley Road, to the east of the application site, is residential in character ranging in character from close knit development at its northern end including some new infill development currently under construction, to dwellings set within large gardens to the south. These gardens support significant mature planting which provide a semi-wooded character and provide an important transition between the centre of the village and the adjoining countryside.

Development Proposals

83. Although the application is submitted in outline form, the means of access, including vehicular access onto Bury Road is included as part of the application as detailed above. As stated above, the site area has been amended and reduced since the application was first submitted.
84. The access from Bury Road is located on the western boundary of the existing public house car park, within an area currently occupied by bottle banks and a timber building. Accordingly, although the proposed access would reduce the capacity of the car park, it is unlikely to have a significantly detrimental impact on capacity. Furthermore, given the informal nature of the existing car park layout, greater efficiency could be made of the remaining space through the provision of marked parking bays.
85. The western boundary of the site is formed by an established hedge and mature trees. It is this boundary planting which one neighbour has requested should be replaced with a 1.8 metre high wall. Although these trees are shown as being retained on the submitted details, the exact alignment of the access road would require careful consideration to minimise the potential for intrusion into the root protection zone of these trees.
86. The application was supported by an indicative layout which served to indicate how the applicant considers development of the scale proposed could be achieved. However, it was submitted for illustrative purposes

only and was not a material consideration in the determination of this application and its inclusion does not imply its acceptability.

87. Notwithstanding the status of the submitted layout plan, it did serve to illustrate the potential impact that development within the site could have and this has been highlighted in the landscape and ecology observations above. The indicative layout would have required the removal of some of the established mature planting and would seriously threaten the long term survival of retained landscaping due to the proximity of dwellings with large trees which would result in severe overshadowing and legitimate fear of damage. As a consequence of the concerns arising from this layout, notwithstanding its supportive status, it has been formally withdrawn from the application

Habitat

88. The submitted indicative layout could have significant adverse impact upon habitat, particularly that resulting from the loss of trees. However, as discussed above, the layout plan has been withdrawn and does not form part of the consideration of this application. However, the means of access are a material consideration and such access cannot be achieved without the loss of one or more trees. The proposal would also require the removal of the existing bungalows which have been identified as having potential bat impact upon bats and their roosting sites. These have been the subject of an ecological survey. This has not identified any significant roosting habitat in the trees potentially affected by the access, but it has identified roosts within the bungalows. This will require mitigation works before any demolition work is carried out as bats are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.

Summary

89. The proposal as amended could have an impact upon gardens and other important green or landscaped areas which make a significant contribution to the character of the area. However, with sensitive layout and design, development of the scale proposed should be possible, maintaining the key characteristics of the locality and maintain a sense of place in accordance with the provisions of Policy DM2. Further work is required, however, in respect of the mitigation in respect of the impact of development upon habitat and biodiversity.

Impact on listed building

90. Part of the proposed development site sits within the curtilage of the Kentford Public House, a Grade 2 listed building. Policy DM15 of the Development Management Policies document requires that any development respects the setting of a listed building, including inward and outward views.
91. The Kentford Public House is a former Coaching Inn which would have formed an important stop when Bury Road formed the main east west highway between Bury St Edmunds and Newmarket and destinations

beyond. As such, it is a substantial building set within grounds of generous proportions, enclosed by long established boundaries formed by trees and hedges.

92. Although access would be taken from the car park to the Public House, its position is located at the western boundary to the site at the furthest point from the listed building. The proposed development would retain a significant part of garden to the public house, with any buildings set back behind an open frontage. However, the design of any development will need to be carefully considered to maintain this important setting

Summary

93. The proposal as amended could have a detrimental impact upon the setting of the listed building. However, with careful layout and design, maintaining the open frontage to the side of the Public House, it should be possible to achieve development without having a detrimental impact upon the setting of the Grade 2 listed building.

Cumulative Impacts

94. Members will be aware that there have been a number of major planning applications for residential development in Kentford in the last two years as detailed above at Kentford Lodge, Jeddah Way and the Animal Health Trust. In total, (with the current application) these schemes will provide up to 151 residential units.
95. The evidence base behind the Development Plan documents will assess potential cumulative impacts of any formal site allocations. No such assessments have been carried out with regard to the potential cumulative impacts of 'developer led' planning applications.
96. This sub-section of the officer assessment considers potential cumulative impacts upon village infrastructure of the current planning application, and the previously approved schemes at Kentford Lodge, Jeddah Way and the Animal Health Trust (planning reference F/2013/0061/HYB, F/2013/0355/FUL and DC/14/0692/FUL respectively).

Primary Education

97. The current planning application would generate approximately 9 children of primary school age, once all dwellings have been built and occupied. The planning applications which have previously been approved would provide up to an additional 117 dwellings, which would generate additional children of primary school age.
98. It is understood that the existing catchment primary school is Moulton CEVCP Primary School. It is currently forecast that there will be no surplus places available at the catchment primary school.

99. Suffolk County Council, in consultation correspondence, has raised no objection to the development proposals. The County Council has advised that, in view of there being no surplus spaces available at Moulton CEVCP Primary School, a financial contribution will be sought to provide additional facilities.
100. The catchment school for secondary education is Newmarket College. There are currently forecast to be sufficient surplus places available at the school and consequently, no contribution is required towards the provision of additional secondary school spaces.

Pre-School Provision

101. The proposed development will generate up to 3 pre-school pupils. A financial contribution is required towards the provision of additional pre-school places which will be provided at Moulton CEVCP Primary School.

Highways

102. Third party comments have raised concern regarding the highway impacts of the development proposals upon Bury Road. The Local Highway Authority has raised no objection to any of the individual planning applications (subject to the imposition of planning conditions as referred to in the relevant section above).
103. The third party concerns are not supported by evidence, or a considered analysis of the nature of the possible impacts. In this context, Members are reminded that the Framework advises that new development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds, if the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.
104. Officers are satisfied that the application proposals would mitigate the impacts of the development on the highways network, by way of both planning conditions and developer contributions, which can be secured through the Section 106 process. Accordingly, the applications will mitigate the impact of the development upon the highways network.

Open Space

105. All of the development schemes incorporate provision for open space – both in terms of on-site provision, and contributions in respect of off-site provision (secured through the Section 106 process). In this regard, the proposals are considered in accordance with Council's Supplementary Planning Document in respect of Open Space.

Landscape

106. Given the locations of the four housing development schemes around Kentford, no cumulative landscape impacts are anticipated.

Utilities

107. Anglian Water Services did not object raise objection to the development proposals, and has confirmed that there is adequate capacity within the system to accommodate the increased flows arising from the development proposal. Officers are satisfied that the development proposals would not have adverse cumulative impacts upon the sewerage systems serving Kentford.
108. There is no evidence to suggest that there would be significant cumulative impacts upon water and energy (electricity) supplies to the village, given the respective capacities identified in the IECA report.

Summary

109. On the basis of the above evaluation, officers are satisfied that the cumulative infrastructure impacts of the proposed residential development (in terms of utilities, landscape, open space, transport and education) would be acceptable. There is no evidence to demonstrate that the development proposal should be refused on these grounds

Section 106 Planning Obligation Issues

110. Planning obligations secured must be in accordance with the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, which came into force on 06 April 2015. In particular, Regulation 122 states that a planning obligation may only constitute a reason for approval if it is:
 - (a) Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
 - (b) Directly related to the development; and
 - (c) Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
111. These are the three principal tests set out in Paragraph 204 of the Framework and are of relevance in guiding the negotiation of planning obligations sought prior to the coming into force of the CIL Regulations. In assessing potential S106 contributions, officers have also been mindful of Core Strategy Policy CS13 and the Suffolk County Council guidance in respect of Section 106 matters, 'A Developers Guide to Infrastructure Contributions in Suffolk'.

Affordable Housing

112. The Framework states that local planning authorities should use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing. It also states that policies should be set for meeting the identified need for affordable housing, although such policies should be sufficiently flexible to take account of changing market conditions.
113. Core Strategy Spatial Objective H2 seeks to provide a sufficient and appropriate mix of housing that is affordable, accessible and designed to a high standard. Core Strategy Policy CS9 requires a target of 30% of the number of net new dwellings in residential schemes of 10 or more

dwellings (or sites of more than 0.33 hectares) to be sought as affordable. This policy is supported by the Joint Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which was adopted by the Council in October 2013. This document sets out the procedures for considering and securing affordable housing provision (including mix, tenure, viability and Section 106 arrangements).

114. As the application is in outline, there is no specific figure for affordable housing, but the submitted Design and Access Statement confirms that 'a number of dwellings (approx. 30%) are likely to be designated as affordable social housing units'. The precise detail of the affordable housing scheme, including location within the development, tenure mix and their transfer to a registered provider can be secured through the S106 planning obligation and the reserved matters process, should the scheme be approved.

Education

115. The Framework, in Paragraph 72, places significant emphasis on the need to provide school places. In particular, local planning authorities are required to take a '*proactive, positive and collaborative approach*' giving '*great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools*'. This approach is supported by Policy CS13 of the Forest Heath Core Strategy, which establishes requirements for infrastructure in the District, with '*new development...[being]...required to demonstrate that it will not harm the District's ability to improve the educational attainment...of Forest Heath's communities*'.
116. The Section 106 Developer's Guide to Infrastructure Contributions in Suffolk sets out the process by which contributions to school infrastructure will be secured. Contributions are based upon an assessment of existing capacity. In line with the policy approach summarised above, developer contributions would usually be sought to provide additional places generated by new residential development.
117. Education provision in Suffolk is currently in the process of a major re-organisation. The information contained within the IECA report relating to education is therefore out of date.

Pre School Provision

118. The consultation response from the Suffolk County Council Planning Obligation's Manager anticipates that the proposed development will yield five pre-school age children. A contribution of £18,273 has therefore been requested by the County Council, to mitigate infrastructure demands generated by the development proposal.

Primary Schools

119. The local catchment primary school is Moulton CEVP. The County Planning Obligation's Manager has confirmed that there is currently forecast to be no surplus available at Moulton Primary School.

120. Officers understand that there are no apparent constraints to the development of the Moulton Primary school site. This suggests that there is space for future building expansion. On this basis, full contributions have been sought by Suffolk County Council (£3,224 per dwelling), to provide additional facilities for the pupils which the proposed development is anticipated to yield.

Upper Schools

121. The catchment secondary school for the proposed development is Newmarket College. Officers are advised that there are currently forecast to be sufficient surplus places available at this school. On this basis, Suffolk County Council is not seeking contributions in respect of secondary school provision.

Libraries

122. Suffolk County Council has identified a need to provide library facilities for the occupiers of this development. A capital contribution of £9,936 has been requested. This can be secured through the S106 planning obligation, if it is CIL compliant to do so.

Public Open Space Provision

123. The Framework confirms that access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities.
124. Core Strategy Spatial Objective CS2 seeks to promote an improvement to the health of people in the District, by maintaining and providing quality open spaces, play and sports facilities and better access to the countryside. Policy CS13 (g) considers provision of open space, sport and recreation as a key infrastructure requirement.
125. Development Management Policies DM2, DM22 and DM42 address play space requirements and state such areas will be provided as an integral part of new residential development. The policies also state that provision will be made for a wider area than just the development site. These policies are expanded upon via the Council's adopted SPD for Public Open Space, Sport and Recreation. This document sets out the requirements for on-site and off-site provision and maintenance.
126. The indicative layout does identify an area of on-site public open space provision. As identified in the landscape and ecology comments above, this is poorly located in the indicative layout. However, the indicative layout does not have any status and does not form part of the consideration of the outline application. Opportunities could arise for suitably located on-site provision, potentially at the northern end of the site, but In accordance with the Council's Supplementary Planning

Document in respect of open space, off site provision can be secured by way of S106 agreement.

Highway Improvements

127. The County Highways Engineer, in consultation correspondence, has requested that the S106 package should include a highways element. In terms of improvements to the local public transport infrastructure, £4000 is sought for raised kerbs.
128. The measures proposed are in the interests of the wider sustainability of the development, and would improve accessibility to alternative forms of transport usage, thus reducing reliance on the motor vehicle.
129. Information provided by the Parish Council has identified an existing issue within the village relating to inappropriate behavior by motorists, in particular, excessive speed along Bury Road. However, the access to serve the proposed development has been designed to accommodate actual speeds rather than just relying upon the speed limit applicable to the locality. This indicates that any need for traffic calming already exists and is not generated, nor exacerbated by this development. In accordance with the 2015 CIL Regulations a contribution cannot be sought from this proposal.

Summary

130. The provisions as described above ensure that the effects of the development proposal on local infrastructure within Kentford - in terms of affordable housing, education, libraries, healthcare, and highways - would be mitigated to the satisfaction of the consultee advice offered.
131. The proposal would comply with Core Strategy Policy CS13 by which the provision or payment is sought for services, facilities and other improvements directly related to development. Officers are satisfied that the proposed planning obligations meet the three tests of planning obligations set out in the Framework, and are therefore entirely justified.
132. The requests for developer contributions as described above will ensure improvements to existing infrastructure within Kentford and the local area, to accommodate the growth of the village and meet the needs of the community, in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS13. Officers are satisfied that they meet the three tests of planning obligations set out in Paragraph 204 of the Framework, and are therefore entirely justified.

Conclusion:

133. The development proposal has been considered against the objectives of the Framework, and the government's agenda for growth, which identifies housing development as a key driver for boosting the economy.

134. Kentford has been identified as a Primary Village that can accommodate some growth within the Council's Core Strategy. In terms of the economic role of sustainable development, the proposed development would provide economic benefits – these relate to the creation of short term jobs in the construction industry, local spending likely to be generated by the proposed residents, and monies from the new homes bonus payments.
135. With regard to the social role of sustainability, the development would provide a level of market and affordable housing to meet the needs of present and future generations.
136. In the context of the environmental role of sustainable development, the landscape would be irreversibly changed as a result of the development proposals. However, this need not result in a significant negative impact upon the immediate environment, nor impact upon the setting of a listed building. On this basis, the effect on the character of the settlement is considered acceptable.
137. The infrastructure pressures generated by the proposed development have been carefully evaluated, with reference to the 2009 IECA report, and additional evidence (including consultation responses and information contained in the application submission). Officers are of the opinion that the infrastructure which has been identified within the IECA report as being at a 'critical and fundamental/essential phase' can be satisfactorily mitigated without significant harm to the village.
138. The absence of capacity at the catchment primary school to cater for the pupils emerging from this development on a permanent basis is a dis-benefit of the scheme. The in-combination effects of this development with other planned developments in Kentford could have significant impacts on primary school education provision. However, in the absence of objections from the Local Education Authority, it would be difficult to robustly defend a reason for refusal on these grounds.
139. Having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and all other material planning considerations, the proposal is considered to be beneficial and the recommendation is one of approval.

Recommendation:

11. That outline planning permission is **APPROVED** subject to:

(1) The completion of a S106 agreement to secure:

- Affordable housing – 30% of the total dwelling units.
- Primary school contribution –£3,224 per dwelling.
- Pre-school contribution - £18,273.
- Highways contributions - £13 731(cycle link across Bury Road), public transport infrastructure: £4,000.
- Open space contribution – in accordance with SPD.

In the event that there are any substantive changes to the S106 package, then this will go back to Members for consideration.

(2) And the following conditions:

1. Outline time limit.
2. Reserved Matters to be agreed (appearance, scale, layout [including internal site layout of roads and ways] and landscaping).
3. Compliance with approved plans.
4. Highways – details of proposed access.
5. Highways – details of bin storage.
6. Highways – details of surface water discharge.
7. Highways – details of carriageways and footways.
8. Highways - details of car parking and manoeuvring areas, including cycle storage.
9. Highways – details of turning space.
10. Highways – provision of visibility splays.
11. Archaeology – implementation of a programme of work; site investigation and post investigation assessment.
12. Contamination – remediation strategy.
13. Contamination – further investigative work if necessary.
14. Details of surface water disposal.
15. No piling or investigation boreholes using penetrative methods.
16. Scheme to provide flood plain compensation.
17. Scheme of surface water drainage/surface water strategy.
18. Scheme for provision and implementation of pollution control.
19. Foul water disposal details.
20. Surface water drainage details.
21. Construction management plan.
22. Hours of construction.
23. Design code.
24. Details of boundary treatment.
25. Samples of materials.
26. Detailed scheme of hard and soft landscaping.
27. Arboricultural Impact Assessment.
28. Tree survey and management plan for tree belts, including planting details.
29. Tree protection details, including details of tree works for retained trees.
30. No development within RPA of existing trees.

- 31.No development to take place until the use of the site by bats has been fully investigated and any mitigation agreed.
- 32.Landscape management plan, including enhancements for biodiversity.
- 33.Details of bat licence.
- 34.Details of lighting.
- 35.Provision of fire hydrants.
- 36.Waste minimisation and recycling strategy.

Documents:

All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online:

<https://planning.westsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/simpleSearchResults.do?action=firstPage>

Alternatively, hard copies are also available to view at Planning, Planning and Regulatory Services, Forest Heath District Council, District Offices, College Heath Road, Mildenhall, Suffolk, IP28 7EY.