



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

DEV/SE/17/013

WORKING PAPER 1

Development Control Committee 6 April 2017

Planning Application DC/16/2837/RM Development Zones G and H, Marham Park, Tut Hill, Fornham All Saints

Date	17.01.2017	Expiry Date:	18.04.2017
Registered:			
Case Officer:	Charles Judson	Recommendation:	Approve
Parish:	Fornham All Saints	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, Fornham All Saints		
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

Background: The application is referred to the Development Control Committee because the application is a major development and the Parish Council object, however the Officer recommendation is for APPROVAL.

Proposal:

1. Planning permission is sought for the approval of details submitted in pursuance of outline planning permission DC/13/0932/HYB. The details include a total of 151 dwellings (including 45 affordable dwellings) and associated access, landscaping and open space.
2. The application has been amended since submission to amend the layout, house types, accommodation schedule and materials.

Application Supporting Material:

3. Information submitted with the application as follows:
 - Application forms and drawings including location plan, site layout, house plans and elevations, materials schedule and parking plan.
 - Design and Access Statement
 - Planning Statement
 - Schedule of accommodation
 - Construction layout
 - Drainage strategy

Site Details:

4. The application site is comprised of two areas known as development Zones G and H. Zone G has an area of 1.48 hectares and Zone H has an area of 2.78 hectares. They are located within a larger strategic site to the north west of Bury St Edmunds and to the south of the village of Fornham All Saints where permission has been granted for residential development under DC/13/0932/HYB. This strategic site is being marketed as 'Marham Park'. A new relief road is under construction to serve the strategic site which will link Tut Hill (B1106) with Mildenhall Road (A1101). Zones G is located to the south of the relief road whilst Zone H is located centrally within the strategic site adjacent to the primary movement corridor and green corridors which act as public open space.

Planning History:

5. The site forms the first of five strategic sites identified by Policy CS11 of the adopted Core Strategy. The policy states that the amount of development will be determined by environmental and infrastructure

capacity considerations and the preparation and adoption of detailed masterplans in which the local community and other stakeholders have been fully engaged.

6. A concept statement was prepared and adopted by the council in 2013. This was incorporated as an appendix to the Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031 and adopted in 2014 following public consultation.
7. A masterplan, which followed the principles established by the concept statement, was prepared by Countryside properties. This was adopted by the council in December 2013 following public consultation. This document set out the key requirements of the development that subsequent planning applications need to deliver.
8. Planning permission was granted in 2014 for development of the site. The application was in hybrid form, providing full details of the relief road, change of use of land to informal countryside recreation and outline for residential development, local centre, employment uses, public open space, allotments and the reservation of land for educational purposes (application DC/13/0932/HYB).
9. Since the granting of application DC/13/0932/HYB applications to discharge a number of conditions have been submitted, the following being particularly relevant:
10. DC/15/0553/RM: Reserved Matters Application for 126 dwellings on Development Zone C. Approved.
11. DC/15/0703/RM: Reserved Matters Application for strategic infrastructure comprising details of roads, footpaths, cycleways, drainage and landscaping details for the first section of the Primary Movement Corridor and Green Corridors G, H, L, J, R and Y. Approved and amended by DC/416/0446/VAR.
12. DC/15/2440/RM: Reserved Matters Application for strategic infrastructure comprising details of roads, footpaths, cycleways, drainage and landscaping details for the second section of the Primary Movement Corridor and landscaping of Green Corridors M, N, O and P. Approved.
13. DC/16/2658/RM: Reserved Matters Application for 132 dwellings on Development Zone C. Undetermined.
14. NMA(A)/13/0932: Non Material Amendment Application to allow provision of 9 additional dwellings (Development zone parcel C). Undetermined.

Consultations:

15. Highways England: No objection

16. Suffolk Wildlife Trust: Whilst there is a landscape plan provided, no Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) is included in the application. We would recommend that an LEMP is prepared for this part of development and that it accords with the documents already produced for the other development parcels. We also recommend that ecological enhancements are secured within the parcels subject to this application. In particular, we recommend that integrated nest boxes suitable for swifts are included within the dwellings and that the garden boundaries used are permeable to hedgehogs. This can be achieved by using concrete or timber fence bases which incorporate a pre-formed hole in the bottom or by including a 13cm by 13cm gap in the bases of fences and walls.
17. Highway Authority: The provision of links to the external cycleway as shown on plan EA-127-SL-900 should be constructed to connect to the cycleway. Those shown from the north of parcel H do not currently connect to the external cycleway and if this cannot be rectified alternative cycle provision should be made to ensure safe cycling routes through the development. The driveway for plot 137 is an incorrect length and should be redesigned accommodate the whole of one or two cars. A condition should be imposed to require details of manoeuvring and parking of vehicles which is to be retained and used for no other purpose.
18. Suffolk County Council (Development Contributions Manager): No comments other than the proviso that the terms of the existing S106A dated 8 October 2014 remain in force.
19. Police Architectural Liaison Officer: Having viewed the plans I have some concerns around the plans in regards to security. My concerns are around lack of natural surveillance, rear car parking, and use of carports, which can allow the opportunity to commit crime.
- Comments on amended plans: No comments received
20. SCC Flood and Water: Holding objection as the drainage strategy does not conform to the site wide strategy.
- Comments on amended plans: SCC Floods have reviewed the amended drainage information submitted by MLM Ltd in respect of the above planning application, the information submitted is acceptable and thus we can remove our holding objection.
21. Anglian Water: The foul drainage strategy is acceptable.
22. Public Health and Housing: No objection
23. Environment Team: This Service has no objection to this Reserved Matters application. We note that discharge of conditions applications for the land contamination conditions are progressing under separate cover.

- 24.Environment Agency: We have no objection the above reserved matters application but wish to make the following advisory comments with respect to surface water drainage. We recommend that the Lead Local Flood Authority should be consulted on any surface water management proposals. Should the applicant propose the use of deep infiltration systems including boreholes and other structures that bypass the soil layer we would wish to be reconsulted. This is because the site overlies a principal aquifer and is located in a Source Protection Zone. Accordingly the site is sensitive to pollution of the water environment.
- 25.Natural England: Based upon the information provided, Natural England advises the Council that the proposal is unlikely to affect any statutorily protected sites or landscapes. We have not assessed this application and associated documents for impacts on protected species and you should apply our Standing Advice. If the proposal site is on or adjacent to a local site the authority should ensure it has sufficient information to fully understand the impact of the proposal on the local site before it determines the application. Opportunities for biodiversity and land landscape enhancements should be considered.
- 26.Sport England: The proposed development is not considered to fall either within our statutory remit (Statutory Instrument 2015/595), or non-statutory remit (National Planning Policy Guidance Par. 003 Ref. ID: 37-003-20140306) upon which we would wish to comment, therefore Sport England has not provided a detailed response.
- 27.Strategy and Enabling Officer: The Strategic Housing Team supports the above Reserved Matters application in principle as it meets our CS5 policy to deliver 30% affordable housing on site. The affordable dwellings will need to be delivered in accordance with the S106 on affordable housing tenure and achieve 70% affordable rent and 30% shared ownership.

The affordable housing mix provided meets the current housing needs for Bury St Edmunds and are dispersed throughout the development to help create sustainable and cohesive communities.

I am however concerned over the proposed dwelling sizes for the affordable homes. It is my understanding that based on the proposed dwelling sizes these are below an acceptable minimum standard being requested by our local Registered Providers operating within West Suffolk and therefore may be difficult to transfer.

Comments on amended plans: Having reviewed the Reserved Matters Application I can confirm that the Strategic Housing supports the affordable housing scheme.

- 28.Public Rights of Way Officer: Public Footpath 4 does not appear to be affected by this proposal. We do not have any objection to this proposal.

Representations:

29. Bury Town Council: Objection on the grounds of overdevelopment.

30. Fornham All Saints Parish Council: Objects and wishes for the following comments to be considered:

Density of 35.88 dwellings per hectare does not compliment the area and is more in keeping with a site within a town rather than edge of town abutting a rural village.

Supports the 30% affordable housing provision but concerned that the mix of market houses which is 95% 3 or 4 bedroom dwellings does not meet local needs identified in the Sub Regional Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The Parish Council would have liked to see the need for smaller dwellings of 1 and 2 bedrooms with a smaller element of 3+ bedroom properties fulfilled for those wishing to downsize.

Concerned that Development Zones G and H will give rise to adverse transport impacts. Parking is inadequate and inappropriately designed which will give rise to parking on road, crime, accessibility issues for emergency vehicles. Access footways of 1.8m is below the Manual for Streets recommendation of 2m to ensure all users can pass unhindered.

Question the proposed street hierarchy and the establishment of restricted vehicular routes at the end of secondary routes due to fears over crime and disorder.

The local highway network will not be able to continue to operate and the Parish Council feels that this application fails to address any existing issues as well as mitigate the impact of the increased traffic resulting from the Bury North-West development.

The Drainage Strategy does not conform to the site wide strategy and the Flood and Water Engineer at SCC has recommended a holding objection. No details on maintenance and management have been submitted and that Parcel H has been tested as not acceptable according to site wide strategy. The Parish Council would wish to see this addressed either prior to permission being given or as a condition to be addressed should permission be granted

31. Ward Member (Councillor Beccy Hopfensperger) No comments received

32. Neighbours: No comments received

Policy: The following policies of the Joint Development Management Policies Document, the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy December 2010 and the Bury Vision 2031 have been taken into account in the consideration of this application:

33. Joint Development Management Policies Document:

- Policy DM1 Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development
- Policy DM2 Creating Places
- Policy DM3 Masterplans
- Policy DM22 Residential Design
- Policy DM46 Parking Standards

34. Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031 (September 2014):

- Policy CS3 Design and Local Distinctiveness
- Policy CS5 Affordable Housing

35. St Edmundsbury Strategy December 2010

- Policy CS2 – Sustainable development
- Policy CS3 Design and Local Distinctiveness
- Policy CS5 Affordable Housing

Other Planning Policy:

36. National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and Planning Practice Guidance

Officer Comment:

37. The issues to be considered in the determination of the application are:

- Principle of development
- Character, context and design
- Other matters

Principle of development

38. The application is for the consideration of reserved matters following the granting of outline planning permission for residential development under planning permission reference DC/13/0932/HYB. That permission established the principle of residential development.

39. Approved as part of DC/13/0932/HYB was a density parameter plan which approved density ranges for each Development Zone providing a range of densities which could be accommodated within each Development Zone. The application proposes 151 dwellings which complies with the density parameter plan for G and H. The number of dwellings proposed is therefore considered acceptable in principle.

Character, context and design

40. Development Zones G and H are located centrally within the site adjacent to green corridors, the primary network corridor, a central public square, the local centre and a potential school site. The relief road which will connect Tut Hill with Mildenhall Road lies to the north of Development Zone G. This road benefits from full planning permission and work is ongoing with its construction. Furthermore, detailed permission has also been given for the primary movement corridor

which fixes the points of vehicular access to the Development Zones and provides a strategic cycle network and permission has also been given for the green infrastructure and network of footpaths, cycleways and landscaping located in the the green corridors which surround the Development Zones.

41. The site was last used for agricultural purposes and inevitably residential development will fundamentally alter the character and appearance of the area. The adopted Masterplan for the development however provides the principles to be carried forward at detailed design stage. The Masterplan defines character areas to guide the form of development and the application has been submitted in the context of this. Development Zones G and H include the following character areas as defined in the Masterplan: Community Heart; Transition Frontage and Semi-formal. To respond to these character areas, towards the north-east the Development Zones it is proposed to have higher density housing with 2.5 and 3 storey dwellings built close to the public highway where the site fronts the public square. A tighter urban grain would also be achieved around a new public green located within the centre of Development Zone H assisting in providing a focal point for development in the form of a traditional village green. Lower density dwellings would be provided towards the periphery of the Development Zones where dwellings front onto the network of green corridors and where dwellings are served by private drives.
42. The application is submitted by a national housebuilding company and the whilst the house types are reflective of this, they have been designed to provide features reflective of the local vernacular and will be detailed to reflect their location within the development and the use of materials, architectural treatment and boundary treatments to help define character areas.
43. Fornham All Saints Parish Council object to the application on the basis that the proposed density is not complimentary to the location of the development adjacent to a rural village and considers that the scheme is more in keeping with development within a town and Bury Town Council object on the grounds of overdevelopment. However, the scheme is in accordance with the density parameter plan and building heights plan approved with the masterplan and application DC/13/0257/HYB and therefore the number of dwellings, density and overall scale is considered acceptable by officers in principle.
44. Overall it is considered that the proposed scale, appearance, layout, treatment of space and road hierarchy is reflective of the adopted masterplan for the site and will result in an acceptable form of development with regard to the character and appearance of the area.

Other Matters:

45. The application proposed 30% affordable housing in accordance with the approved Affordable Housing Framework (which sets the amount of affordable housing across the development). The Councils Strategy

and Enabling Officer supports the mix and clustering of affordable dwellings and whilst they initially objected to the size of some of the affordable units, following amendments to increase the size of the 2 bedroom affordable dwellings this objection has been withdrawn and the application now benefits from the support of the Strategy and Enabling Officer.

46. The Suffolk County Council Flood and Water Engineer also raised an objection to the development as the proposed drainage strategy did not accord with the approved site wide strategy. However, the Flood and Water Engineer has confirmed, following discussions with the applicants surface water drainage consultants, that there was an incorrect reference on a submitted drawing and they have removed their holding objection. In any case, details of surface water drainage are controlled by a separate condition on the Hybrid Application and details of which will need to be approved under separate cover to this reserved matters application. It is not considered that approval of the scheme as submitted will fetter the Council in its ability to assess the surface water drainage scheme at a later date when it is formally submitted for consideration.
47. The Highway Authority is satisfied that sufficient parking is provided to serve the housing mix with the level of parking complying with the Suffolk Parking Standards. The parking strategy for the residents incorporates on-curtilage and in-garage parking and the use of small parking courts. Where the later is used it is considered that the spaces are related reasonably well to the dwellings that they would serve to ensure that they will be used by residents and to discourage parking in locations not designated for parking. Visitor parking is provided in dedicated parking bays provided in parallel to the road and the number of spaces complies with the Suffolk Parking Standards. An amended layout has been provided to address the Highway Authority comments regarding plot 137. Officers are therefore satisfied that the parking proposed is acceptable. Fornham All Saints Parish Council has objected to the application due to potential impacts on the functioning of the local highway network however the number of dwellings is in accordance with the Hybrid Application and the capacity of the highway network was assessed and appropriate mitigation, including off site highway improvements, were secured. Officers therefore do not consider it necessary to re-asses the capacity of the local highway network as part of this Reserved Matters application given that it complies in principle with the Hybrid Application.
48. The Highway Authority requested that an off carriageway foot/cycleway is incorporated into Development Zone H to provide a connection from the approved access to the north-east into the application site and to terminate at plot 75 to the north-west of the central green to ensure a safe cycle route into and out of the development. This request was put to the applicants but they have chosen not to amend their scheme to incorporate this request and instead submitted an amended plan showing two connections to the green corridor to the north of Development Zone H. These however do

not connect to the approved cycle and footpath network and the applicant is unable to amend this network as the green corridors are outside of their control. However, Development Zone H would be well served by other connections to the external footway and cycleway which is directly adjacent to this parcel and given the number of dwellings within this Development Zone and given that vehicle speeds are likely to be low it is considered that the scheme as submitted provides a safe environment for cyclists with adequate connections to the strategic cycle network.

49. Fornham All Saints Parish Council have raised objections to the mix of market housing and are concerned at the lack of 1 and 2 bedroom properties and the predominance of 3 and 4 bedroom dwellings. Officers have raised this concern with the applicants but the mix has not been amended. Instead the applicants have identified that the adopted Masterplan confirms that the site will focus on delivering family housing of a range of types and styles. When regard is had to the affordable housing mix which focusses on the delivery on 1, 2 and 3 bedroom dwellings it is considered that the overall housing mix provides a good range of dwellings of varied size and will be complimentary to mix of housing which has been approved elsewhere on the Marham Park site where there is a greater proportion of smaller properties for market sale.

50. The Police Architectural Liaison Officer raised some specific concerns regarding the scheme including the need to ensure parking areas have good levels of natural surveillance, raising concern at the use of car ports and the inclusion of long paths to rear gardens. Amended plans have been submitted by the applicants to address some of these concerns by, for example, introducing garages instead of car ports and improving surveillance of parking courts. The Police Architectural Liaison Officer has not commented on the amended plans but Officers consider that the revised proposal has resulted in a more acceptable proposal in terms of preventing crime and disorder.

51. Comments have been received from Suffolk Wildlife Trust concerning the need to secure a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan for this development. Members are advised that this is already required by condition on the Hybrid Application and this will need to be discharged prior to the commencement of development on these Development Zones.

Conclusion:

52. In conclusion, the principle and detail of the development is considered to be acceptable and in compliance with relevant development plan policies and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Recommendation:

53.It is recommended that planning permission be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

1. 14FP – Compliance with plans

Documents:

All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online here: <DC/16/2837/RM>.