



*St Edmundsbury*  
BOROUGH COUNCIL

# DEV/SE/17/018

## Development Control Committee 3 May 2017

### Planning Application DC/16/2837/RM Development Zones G and H, Marham Park, Tut Hill, Bury St Edmunds

**Date:** 17.01.2017      **Expiry Date:** 18.04.2017  
**Registered:**      **EOT:** 10.05.2017

**Case Officer:** Charles Judson      **Recommendation:** Approve

**Parish:** Bury St Edmunds      **Ward:** Fornham

**Proposal:** Reserved Matters Application – Submission of details under Planning Permission DC/13/0932/HYB – the means of access, appearance, landscaping, layout, parking, and scale for Development Zones G and H

**Site:** Development Zones G and H, Marham Park, Tut Hill, Bury St Edmunds

**Applicant:** Jaimie Wragg, Bloor Homes Eastern

**Synopsis:**

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

**Recommendation:**

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

CONTACT CASE OFFICER:

Charles Judson

Email: Charles.judson@westsuffolk.gov.uk

Telephone: 01638 719267

## **Section A – Summary:**

1. The application was deferred from consideration at the Development Control Committee meeting on 6 April 2017 in light of Members' concerns, to enable Officers to work with the applicant to seek improvements to the scheme where possible.
2. The previous Officer report for the 6 April 2017 meeting of the Development Control Committee is included as Working Paper 1 to this report. Members are directed to this paper in relation to site description, details of development, details of consultation responses received etc.
3. This report sets out the updates from the written papers presented to the meeting of Development Control Committee on 6 April 2017.
4. The Officer recommendation, which is set out at the end of this report remains that planning permission should be approved.
5. Since the Committee meeting on 6 April 2017 the applicants have submitted the following information:
  - Amended Boundary Treatments Plan
  - Amended Layout Plan
  - Amended Parking and Refuse Plan
  - Additional Context Plan
  - Additional Vehicle Tracking Plan
  - Additional Character Areas Plan
  - Details of storage sheds
  - Photos of private drives in Sudbury and Martlesham

## **Section B – General Information:**

### **Proposal:**

6. Please refer to Working Paper 1, paragraphs 1-2 for a description of the application proposals.

### **Application Supporting Material:**

7. Please refer to Working Paper 1, paragraph 3 for details of the drawings and technical information submitted with the planning application.

### **Site Details:**

8. Please refer to Working Paper 1, paragraph 4 for a description of the application site.

### **Planning History:**

9. Please refer to Working Paper 1, paragraphs 5-14 for details of relevant

planning history.

**Consultation:**

10. Please refer to Working Paper 1, paragraphs 15 - 28 for details of consultation responses received.
11. Since the Development Control Committee on 6<sup>th</sup> April 2017 further comments have been sought from the Police Architectural Liaison Officer and officers have held meetings with the Highway Authority and Strategy and Enabling Officer, the outcome of which is discussed below.
12. Any further consultation responses received will be reported verbally at the meeting.

**Representations:**

13. Please refer to Working Paper 1, paragraphs 29 - 32 for details of representations received.

**Policies:**

14. Please refer to Working Paper 1, paragraphs 33 - 36 for details of relevant planning policies and considerations.

**Officer Comment:**

15. Please refer to Working Paper 1, paragraphs 37 - 52 for details of the Officers assessment of the application proposals.

**Section C - Background**

16. The application seeks reserved matters approval for the means of access, appearance, landscaping, layout, parking, and scale for Development Zones G and H pursuant to planning application DC/13/0932/HBY (the Hybrid application).
17. The Hybrid application granted permission for the change of use of agricultural land to provide a new country park for informal recreation, full planning permission for a new link road and outline permission for residential development, a local centre, land for primary education, and public open space including formal recreation. This permission was granted following the allocation of the site in Bury Vision 2031, and the subsequent production of a concept statement and Masterplan setting out the parameters and vision for the development.
18. Contained within the Masterplan and approved with the Hybrid application are 5 parameter plans which dictate maximum building heights, the location of strategic landscape and open space, density ranges for the development zones, access and movement corridors and details of land use.

19. The application for reserved matters for development zones G and H being considered by Members must be considered in accordance with the relevant development plan policies and in the context of the adopted Masterplan, Hybrid application and any other material considerations including the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance.
20. Since the granting of the Hybrid application work has commenced on the construction of the link road and associated infrastructure. Furthermore, reserved matters approvals have been granted for the laying out and landscaping of the primary movement corridor and strategic green infrastructure which surround the development zones. These permissions have fixed the points of vehicular access in to the development zones and provided a network of cycle paths, footpaths, green space and play space around the development zones.
21. Reserved matters approval has also been granted at Development Control Committee for 126 dwellings on development zone C. This application therefore represents the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> development zones being considered for reserved matters approval.

#### **Section D – Update:**

22. At the Development Control Committee on 6<sup>th</sup> April 2017 Members raised a number of concerns primarily relating to the density and design of the proposal, the floorspace of the properties, the level of open space, the level of parking provision, the provision of safe cycle links and the width of the roads within the scheme.
23. Officers have discussed these issues with the applicant which has led to the submission of amended and additional information as listed in paragraph 5 of this report.

#### **Density, Design and Open Space**

24. With regard to the density of the development, the applicants have not altered the number of dwellings proposed and therefore it is still proposed to develop 151 dwellings at an overall density of 35.95 dwellings per hectare (dph). This accords with the density parameter plan which was approved with the Hybrid application and forms part of the Masterplan for the site which allows a density range of 27.5 – 37.5 dph across both development zones. Reserved Matters approval has previously been granted by Members on development zone C located to the west of the application site for a development of 126 dwellings at a density of 34dph. Given that the proposed density of development complies with the approved density parameter plan officers are of the opinion that the density of development is a matter which is acceptable in principle. Furthermore, given the density of the approved scheme on development zone C officers are of the opinion that the density proposed would be consistent with existing permissions at Marham Park.

25. Officers are of the opinion that the design and layout of the development represents a positive scheme which complies with the Masterplan and Hybrid application details. The scheme has been designed to address the landscape zones, primary movement corridor and link road which surround these development zones. To the edge of the site, dwellings would front onto the site boundaries and the internal layout of the development zones would result in an appropriately designed development with a variety of dwelling types, a variety of road surfaces, buildings designed to turn corners, an avoidance of large parking courts and a variety of appropriate materials. The approved parameter plans allow for taller dwellings adjacent to the local centre of formal character whilst elsewhere dwellings will exhibit a semi-formal adjacent to the primary movement corridor and informal character of a more suburban nature adjacent to the green infrastructure.
26. The Framework Plan and Landscape and Ecology Strategy within the adopted Masterplan identifies that development Zone H would have a local green and this has been provided as part of the proposed scheme to act as a focal point for this zone. Whilst there is no other significant open space provided within the development zones, they are surrounded by corridors of strategic green infrastructure and a new countryside park for informal recreation is provided to the north of the link road. This green infrastructure has been designed to provide suitable levels of space for informal recreation and play and therefore there is no policy requirement to provide significant landscaping within development zones. Members are advised that a play area has been approved within the green corridor to the west of development zone H with good levels of access to these areas from the development zones.
27. Submitted with the application is a proposed landscape strategy which identifies how soft landscaping will be incorporated into the development and a condition on the Hybrid permission will require further information to be submitted in this respect. To enhance the character and appearance of the site, since the Development Control Committee meeting on 6<sup>th</sup> April, the applicants have submitted an amended plan to increase the length of a proposed flint wall to front the link road and to also provide a greater proportion of estate railing. Officers consider that these amendments further enhance the character of the development however a condition should be imposed to require precise details of the estate railing, flint wall and knee rail fence to be submitted for approval concurrently with the details of soft landscaping required by condition C30 of the Hybrid permission. Members requested that further comments were obtained from the Police Architectural Liaison Officer who made no comments on the revised plans submitted by the applicant. Officers have requested that the Police Architectural Liaison Officer submits further comments but these have not been provided at the time of writing and will therefore be reported verbally to Members.
28. Taking account of the above it is considered that the principle of 151 dwellings is acceptable and these dwellings have been designed with appropriate regard to the adopted masterplan, the parameters of the Hybrid application and the constraints and opportunities afforded by the

existing reserved matters approvals.

### **Size of Dwellings**

29. Members raised concern at the Development Control Committee on 6th April with the size of the properties proposed. The applicants have not submitted amendments since this meeting to increase the size of the proposed dwellings. The Planning Practice Guidance directs that where a Local Planning Authority wishes to require an internal space standard they should do so by reference in their Local Plan to the nationally described space standard. Members are advised that St Edmundsbury Borough Council have not adopted the nationally described space standards within their Local Plan and accordingly there is no local planning policy requirement for dwellings to meet these standards. Policy DM22 does however require new housing to be fit for purpose and function well, providing adequate space, light and privacy and officers are of the opinion that the dwellings meet this policy requirement. The submitted plans show how rooms can be laid out with furniture and rooms would be well served by light and ventilation with gardens and suitable access to green infrastructure providing sufficient levels of amenity for occupants. To provide some context to the size of dwellings proposed the applicants have been asked to provide a comparison with the size of the dwellings they propose to other dwellings in Bury St. Edmunds and they have provided the following comparisons:

- Bloor 2 bedroom (House type 200 - Penhallam) is similar in size to a 2 bedroom house on Kings Road (57.7sqm compared to 54sqm).
- Bloor 3 bedroom (House type 305 - Staunton) is similar in size to a 3 bedroom house on York Road (83.34sqm compared to 83.4sqm).
- Bloor 4 bedroom (House type 454 - Landgaurd) is similar in size to a 4 bedroom house on Home Farm Lane (155sqm compared to 140sqm).

30. Members will note from Working Paper 1 that the Strategy and Enabling Officer expressed concern that that the size of some of the affordable dwellings would be too small to be attractive to Registered Providers and amendments were secured to increase the size of the 2 bedroom dwellings. Following these amendments the Strategy and Enabling Officer confirmed that they do not object to the application. Further discussions have been held with the Strategy and Enabling Officer following the Development Control Committee on 6th April and they have reiterated that they do not object to the size of the affordable dwellings bearing in mind the amendments which were secured and the requirements of the section 106 agreement.

31. The scheme provides 2 No. affordable dwellings to meet the Lifetime Homes standard as is required by a condition imposed on the Hybrid permission. In the absence of a policy which requires a greater proportion of Lifetime Homes to be provided, and bearing in mind the proposal meets the requirements that are stipulated in the Hybrid application when the principle of development was established, the applicant has not provided more Lifetime Homes. The applicants have however confirmed that that

all ground floor doorways are wide enough to accommodate wheelchair users and that access to the properties from the street are also wheelchair accessible.

### **Vehicular Parking and Road Widths**

32. The level of vehicular parking was discussed at the Development Control Committee on 6th April with Members raising concern that a lack of parking and the width of some roads could restrict the movement of emergency vehicles through the site. Officers have held a further meeting with officers of the Highway Authority and they have confirmed that they consider access arrangements for emergency vehicles in their response to all planning applications of this nature. Furthermore, the ability for fire engines to reach dwellings is a matter controlled by the Building Regulations and this has been confirmed by the Councils Principal Building Control Officer. The width of the estate roads will be 5.5m with 1.8m wide footpaths to either side, the shared surfaces would also be 5.5m but extended to 6.1m in width as service strips will be hard surfaced and the private drives would be a minimum of 4m. The Highway Authority have advised that these are appropriate widths and the number of vehicular access points is significantly above the standards required by the Highway Authority. Furthermore, the inclusion of shared surfaces and private drives is a common feature in modern developments and contributes towards providing an interesting public realm. Officers are therefore satisfied that the hierarchy and design of roads is acceptable and adequate regard has been given to emergency access.
33. The level of vehicular parking provided meets, and in some instances exceeds, the parking requirements in the Suffolk Parking Standards. These require that 1 bedroom properties are provided 1 space per dwelling; 2 bedroom properties are provided 1.5 spaces (or 2 spaces where in curtilage or in tandem) per dwelling; 3 bedroom properties are provided 2 spaces per dwelling and 4 bedroom dwellings are provided 3 spaces per dwelling. Parking is provided to meet these standards and all 2 bedroom properties are provided with 2 spaces (rather than 1.5 spaces). Furthermore, visitor parking is provided at 0.25 spaces per dwelling resulting in an additional 38 spaces within dedicated laybys. These are the same standards that were applied to the consideration of the approved reserved matters application on development zone C and the Highway Authority have confirmed to officers that they do not consider it justified to require parking above these standards. All garages, which are to contribute to meeting the parking standards are a minimum of 6m x 3m and additional storage a minimum of 3sq m will be provided for each dwelling. The Suffolk Parking Standards are up to date having been adopted in November 2014 and subsequently amended in November 2015 and are considered a robust standard on which to base planning decisions. Officers therefore consider that the level of parking proposed is acceptable being in accordance with local policies.

### **Provision of Cycle Links**

34. In their consideration of the application the Highway Authority requested

that either a 3m shared footpath and cycleway was provided within the development zone or greater provision was made for providing linkages to the strategic cycle network which surrounds the development zones. The submitted plans show the provision of 8 points of connection. At the Development Control Committee on 6th April Members were advised that two of the proposed linkages from the north of development zone H did not connect to the approved cycle network and that an amendment would be required to this landscape zone which was outside of the applicants control. The developers (Countryside) who control the green corridors have confirmed to officers that an application to amend the cycle network is due to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority imminently. Officers are therefore satisfied that the proposed links to the north of development zone H will provide adequate and safe access for cyclists to the strategic cycle network. The applicant has shown the revised cycle path on their amended plans.

### **Section E - Conclusions:**

35. Members are advised that Officers consider that the application complies with the adopted Masterplan, the Hybrid application and the relevant policies of the development plan and accordingly it is recommended that the application is approved subject to the following conditions:

- Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and documents
- Details of flint wall, estate railing and knee rail fence to be provided concurrently with details required by condition C30 of DC/13/0932/HYB

36. Members are advised that no further conditions are required as the Hybrid application secures all other necessary details not submitted with this reserved matters application.

### **Documents:**

All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online: [Plans and documents](#)

Case Officer: Charles Judson

Date: 19 April 2017