

# DEV/SE/17/026

## Development Control Committee 6 July 2017

### Planning Applications DC/16/2836/RM and DC/17/0048/FUL – Land North West of Haverhill, Anne Sucklings Lane, Little Wratting

<b>Date Registered:</b>	19.01.2017	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	EOT until 12 <sup>th</sup> July 2017.
<b>Case Officer:</b>	Penny Mills	<b>Recommendation:</b>	Grant – subject to present concerns in relation to SUDS being satisfactorily addressed and subject to final agreement of the site wide Design Code.
<b>Parish:</b>	Haverhill	<b>Ward:</b>	Haverhill North
<b>Proposal:</b>	<b>DC/16/2836/RM</b> - Reserved Matters Application - Submission of details under outline planning permission SE/09/1283/OUT - The appearance, layout, scale, access and landscaping for 200 dwellings, together with associated private amenity space, means of enclosure, car parking, vehicle and access arrangements together with proposed areas of landscaping and areas of open space for a phase of residential development known as Phase 1.  <b>DC/17/0048/FUL</b> - Change of use of land to highway use for 1no. point of vehicular access/egress to public highway - Haverhill Road and creation of hard standing for foot/cycle way - following planning application- SE/09/1283 as amended by plans dated 28th April 2017.		
<b>Site:</b>	Land North West Of Haverhill, Anne Sucklings Lane, Little Wratting		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr David Moseley		

**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 applications and associated matters.

CONTACT CASE OFFICER:

Penny Mills

Email: penny.mills@westsuffolk.gov.uk

Telephone: 01284 757367

**Background:**

**These applications are referred to the Development Control Committee as the development is considered to be of wider significance and due to the presence of objections from the Town Council in the context of an Officer recommendation of approval. This reserved matters application seeks approval of the detail for the first phase of one of the two strategic growth sites for Haverhill. The separate full planning application seeks consent for a vehicular access that did not form part of the original outline consent.**

**The wider North-West Haverhill site has been the subject of significant public engagement through the preparation and adoption of a Concept Statement and a Masterplan. The Masterplan addressed a wide range of key issues including the distribution of uses, the location of the relief road, design principles, open spaces, accessibility and built form.**

**The proposals are considered to comply with the relevant policies of the development plan, with the National Planning Policy Framework and are considered to be acceptable in all other material respects. The applications are therefore recommended for approval.**

**Proposal:**

1. Planning permission is sought for the reserved matters (access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for Phase 1 of the development, pursuant to the outline planning permission, ref: SE/09/1283. Permission is also sought for the creation of a further vehicular access from Haverhill Road and the creation of a hard surfaced pedestrian and cycle path.
2. The revised reserved matters application provides the details for 200 dwellings with associated private amenity space, means of enclosure, car parking, vehicle and access arrangements together with proposed areas of landscaping and areas of open space.
3. The dwellings are split into three distinct parcels:
  - A Northern parcel comprising 120 homes obtaining vehicular access from the internal spine road served off the western spur from the approved roundabout on Haverhill Road;

- A Southern parcel comprising 75 homes which obtain vehicular access from a new priority junction with Haverhill Road, which is the subject of associated application DC/17/0048/FUL; and,
  - A small cluster of 5 detached houses south of Boyton Woods fronting onto Ann Suckling Road.
4. The scheme includes 60 affordable houses (which equates to 30%), comprising a mix of 18 Intermediate and 42 Affordable Rented dwellings. The scheme includes 5 bungalows which comprise part of the affordable housing offer.
  5. The application has been amended since submission to amend the layout, house types, open spaces, landscaping and street hierarchy.
  6. A Design Code for the entire site was submitted alongside the applications as required by condition B8 of the Outline Permission. The latest version of this document is currently under consideration by the relevant Officers.

### **Application Supporting Material:**

7. The following documents accompany the planning application forms and comprise the planning application (including amendments/additional information received after the application was registered):

Reports (all received in December 2016 with the planning application, unless stated).

- Arboricultural Statement
- Drainage Impact Assessment Report
- Ecological Due Diligence Report
- Ecological Scoping Survey
- Knotweed Surveys
- Phase 1a/b hazel dormouse response
- Phase 2 Ecological Surveys and Assessment
- Anglian Water Pre-Planning Assessment Report
- Design, Access and Compliance Statement
- Phase 1 and 2 Desk Study and Site Investigation Report
- Design Code (12.06.2017)

8. Plans – A list of plans is shown at the end of this report.

### **Site Details:**

9. The site forms the eastern section part of the wider strategic site identified by Policy HV3 of the Haverhill Vision 2031, granted outline approval under SE/09/1283. It is positioned on the north western edge of Haverhill, adjacent to Haverhill Road. The majority of the site is agricultural fields, although an area of Boyton Wood to the south is incorporated within the site where it runs along Ann Suckling Road.
10. The majority of the site, which is relatively flat, is agricultural land, bounded by hedges and ditches, with a notable hedge and tree belt running east-west through the centre of the site.

11. To the east of the site on Haverhill Road there is some linear residential development, mostly consisting of large dwellings in good sized plots, set back from the highway. Moving towards the town to the south development becomes more closely knit with modest terraces fronting the highway. To the southwest of the site is Ann Suckling Road. On the southern side of this highway there is a large-scale residential development, mostly dating from the 1970s. On the northern side, development is less dense with properties set some distance from the highways with extensive screening vegetation, as well as some newer individual dwellings closer to the junction with Haverhill Road.

### **Planning History:**

12. A concept statement for the NW Haverhill site was adopted by the Council in October 2007. The Masterplan was adopted in June 2009 with revisions to the density parameters and height parameters approved in 2011.
13. SE/09/1283 - 1. Planning Application - (i) construction of relief road and associated works (ii) landscape buffer 2. Outline Planning Application - (i) residential development (ii) primary school (iii) local centre including retail and community uses (iv) public open space (v) landscaping (vi) infrastructure, servicing and other associated works as supported by additional information and plans received 27th September 2010 relating to landscape and open space, flood risk, environmental statement, drainage, layout, ecology, waste, renewable energy and transport issues including treatment of public footpaths and bridle paths. - Application Granted - 27.03.2015
14. DC/16/1152/EIASCR - EIA Screening Opinion under Regulation 5 (1) of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2011 on the matter of whether or not the proposed development is an EIA development -Development of up to 190 homes – Screening Opinion Not required.

### **Consultations:**

15. **Highways England: No objection** in respect of both DC/17/0048/FUL and DC/16/2836/RM
16. **Suffolk County Highways:**

#### In respect of DC/17/0048/FUL: No objections

- Recommends that any permission be subject to conditions in relation to: access in accordance with DM03; details of surface water treatment; and, visibility splays.

In respect of DC/16/2836/RM: Able to recommend conditions subject to final concerns being addressed.

Minor concerns to be addressed in the latest amendment are as follows:

- Car spaces for plots 32, 97 and 155 have access coming off of the ramps, this will make manoeuvring difficult over different level kerb lines and also be detrimental to the road and pavement surface. These spaces will need to be relocated away from the junctions and ramps. Once this has been achieved and a plan showing the parking that meets SCC Parking Guidance 2015 (not just St Eds Parking Policy), I would be able to condition the parking. If SCC parking standards are not met, the site would not meet our

adoptable standards and therefore we would not look to adopt this development.

- This parking needs to be on plot or dedicated parking with visitor parking as separate spaces or safe places where visitors could park.
- Service strips adjacent to plots 135 and 131 should be detailed as block and not grass verge, as this area will be overrun and grass will not grow. This applies to any other areas of similar construction on tight bends and junctions.
- I have conditioned below all visibility splays to be to manual for streets, however, please note that trees along the main access road are in the visibility splays, even after this amended drawing. They will need to be set back as not to impede visibility and use of the footways or removed.
- Trees are also shown at the ends of layby's, these are to be relocated or removed due to a) visibility and b) distance from highway. It is against highway law for them to be 4.52m from the centre of the carriageway and our policy to be within 5m of the carriageway or overhang footways/cycleways. In some instances, we may allow trees to be planted in tree pits with a commuted sum, however they should still not overhang public parking, footways, cycleways or carriageway.
- Shared access to parking for plots 114 to 162 should be 4.5m not 4m as shown.

17. **Suffolk Rights of Way: no objections** and provided the following advice:

- No comments or observations to make in respect of this application directly affecting any public rights of way.
- Separate discussions are taking place between West Suffolk Council and Suffolk County Council on the highway layout of Haverhill North West, which includes Public Rights of Way.

18. **Ramblers:** provided the following **comments:**

In respect of DC/16/2836/RM:

- There are, at present, no public rights of way within the Phase 1 area although, there is one near 'The Fox' on the other side of the A143, (Little Wratting fp 8), heading south, and another a short distance along the A143, (Little Wratting fp 3), heading north. Both of these footpaths are, as would be expected, unsurfaced, until reaching 'civilisation'.
- Being so far from the town centre, this situation is likely to create a feeling of isolation for the new occupiers of Phase 1. I am aware that the overall Master Plan includes linear parks, footpaths and cycle routes, providing links to town via Haverhill fp 32 and the Railway Walk, and to the Wrattings via Little Wratting fp 6, but it may be some years before the various phases of development reach them, Phase 1 being at the extremity of the overall development. It is hoped that there will be an interim arrangement, particularly as far as a link with the Railway Walk is concerned, otherwise the only route for a 'walk into town' will be via highway footpaths alongside the A143.

In respect of DC/17/0048/FUL:

- It is immediately apparent that there are significant differences between the Master Plan and the layout proposals now to hand for Phase 1 South, in particular the vehicular access arrangements.
- Whereas, previously, all traffic from this phase would have reached the A143 via a roundabout at the junction with the relief road, or, to a lesser extent, via Ann Suckling Road, it is now, apparently, intended to direct almost all the traffic from the phase to the A143 via two intermediate accesses, one being to estate road standard. This arrangement will, surely, in the long term, create additional hazards, not only for motorists approaching or leaving the new roundabout, (or Phase 1 South), on a bend, but also for pedestrians and cyclists on the new frontage foot/cycle way.
- Is it, perhaps, the intention of the developers to treat Phase 1 South as 'stand alone' and to defer any highway works beyond their newly proposed Phase 1 South entrance until such time as Phase 1 North is under way? Clarification is required if you are minded to approve this proposal.
- I remarked that it appeared to be 'the intention of the developers to treat Phase 1 South as 'stand alone', and to defer any highway works beyond their newly proposed Phase 1 South entrance until such time as Phase 1 North is under way'. Something similar might be said, but more so, about footpath and cycleway links.

**19. West Suffolk Public Health and Housing:**

In respect of DC/17/0048/FUL: **No objections.**

In respect of DC/16/2836/RM: **Initial objection** overcome by additional information, subject to the use of a condition.

Summary of comments dated 9<sup>th</sup> February:

- Baseline noise levels for the site were included in Volume 1 of the Environmental Statement with the Outline application.
- A condition was dealing with noise mitigation measures recommended but not included in the outline approval.
- Condition B7 of the Outline Permission requires the first submission of Reserved Matters to include a Design Code for the whole of the development granted Outline Planning Permission in order to develop and interpret the approved parameter plans. The Design Code should also provide details and guidance on noise attenuation measures where necessary.
- This application does not appear to include any additional information with regard to noise levels or proposed noise mitigation measures.
- Public Health and Housing are of the opinion that the baseline noise levels, following noise monitoring undertaken almost 9 years ago, may not reflect the current noise climate in the vicinity of the application site. It is therefore recommended that a further noise assessment should be undertaken in accordance with BS 8233:2014. This will enable the developer to identify

those properties which will require noise mitigation measures to be installed in order to achieve the guideline indoor ambient noise levels, as recommended in Table 4 of BS 8233:2014. Furthermore, if there is a reliance on keeping windows closed in order to meet the guide values, full details should be provided of an appropriate alternative ventilation system that does not compromise the façade insulation or the resulting noise level.

- Consideration should also be given to noise levels within the proposed external amenity spaces, particularly in respect of the dwellings to the southern boundary of the application site.
- The original noise predictions were based on traffic assessments carried out in 2009. I would again argue that traffic flows would have increased over the last 8 years and a further traffic assessment in accordance with BS 8233:2014 should be undertaken. The standard also states that it is usual to make traffic flow rate forecasts 15 years ahead; the submitted traffic flow data currently provided only predicts flow up to 2019.
- The floor areas of a number of the proposed bedrooms are small and would not comply with the minimum requirements for single or double bedrooms, as recommended on the regulation of "Crowding and Space". It is therefore recommended that consideration is given to the proposed layout of the accommodation so as to ensure that any single bedroom has a minimum floor area of 6.5m<sup>2</sup>, and double bedrooms have a minimum floor area of 9.5m<sup>2</sup>.

Summary of comments received 19<sup>th</sup> May in response to Noise Survey and Acoustic Design Report:

- I have reviewed the submitted Noise Survey and Acoustic Design Advice report prepared by the FES Group, following noise monitoring over a 24 hour period on the 4 and 5 May 2017. The monitoring location was at the front elevation of proposed Plot 185, which is about 20 m from the nearest carriageway and is considered to be representative of the dwellings nearest to the noise source. The results are comparable to the previous noise assessment in 2008 for Position P1 although monitoring at that time was within 8m of the carriageway.
- Our concerns with regard to the traffic assessment have also been addressed but the figures are based on the same rate of increase assumed previously and calculations in accordance with the Calculation of Road Traffic Noise (CRTN) as advised in BS 8233:2014.
- The report concludes that if the properties are built of brick/cavity/block construction and the glazing is double in the form of two panes of 4mm glass with a 20mm airgap between, fitted with trickle vents, the internal day and night time noise levels will be below the threshold guidance as stated in Table 4 of BS 8233:2014. Calculated daytime internal levels are stated at 32.3 dB LAeq,16hour, whilst night time are 23.3dB LAeq, 8 hour. Interestingly, the glazing specification in the 2008 report suggests 4mm glazing with a 16mm air gap.
- It is however assumed that these levels can be obtained with the trickle vents open, as stated in Note 5, although the noise report does not specifically state that this is the case. Furthermore, an openable window

will increase internal noise levels by 10-15dB, therefore, if the windows need to be closed to meet the guideline values, these being 35 dB LAeq,16hour during the daytime and 30 dB LAeq,8 hour at night, there needs to be an appropriate alternative means of ventilation that does not compromise the façade insulation or the resulting noise level. This does not appear to have been considered in the current report.

- With regard to external amenity space, whilst the report states that there will be some shielding of noise by the houses themselves, as gardens tend to be at the rear, the gardens should be enclosed by 1.8m high close boarded fencing with a density of at least 15kg/sq.m. Whilst this may be the case, it would be helpful if noise levels within external amenity spaces, based on the current submitted site layout, were modelled.
- Overall, the noise report is a little sparse and no noise data has been provided to see maximum noise levels (although these are not now stated in Table 4. of BS 8233:2014.
- The current application is for dwellings only in Phase 1, therefore, we do not need to consider noise from any business or commercial premises at this time. If we include a condition with regard to the acoustic insulation of the dwellings to comply with BS 8233:2014, hopefully this will address my above concerns.

## 20. **West Suffolk Strategy and Enabling Officer:**

In respect of DC/17/0048/FUL: **No comments.**

In respect of DC/16/2836/RM: **No objections** and made the following comments:

- Strategic Housing support this application to provide 60 dwellings of affordable housing to meet the 30% affordable housing requirement in line with Policy CS5.
- Some minor comments on the floor plans submitted as follows –
  - Plots 63 & 64 (Plan House type M) appear to have an office on the first floor. As this dwelling is in fact supposed to be a three bedroom house the 'office' should be eliminated and labelled as a bedroom
  - Plots 147, 148, 149 (Plan House Type L) again appears to have an 'office' on the first floor. As this is in fact supposed to be a four bedroom house the 'office' should be eliminated and consideration be given to the proposed layout of the accommodation so to ensure that a fourth bedroom is provided at a reasonable size for a bedroom. The 'office' shown appears to be too small to simply be converted to a 'bedroom'.
  - Plot 128 (Plan House Type B)- Bedrooms 2 & 3 appear to be extremely small for the number of persons required to sleep in the room. I would wish to understand a basic furniture layout and how furniture would fit in alongside the beds shown on the plans.

## 21. **NATS Safeguarding** – **no objections** as the proposed development has been examined from a technical safeguarding aspect and does not conflict with their safeguarding criteria.



22. Natural England – **No objections** and provided the following advice:

In respect of Statutory nature conservation sites:

- Based upon the information provided, Natural England advises the Council that the proposal is unlikely to affect any statutorily protected sites or landscapes.

In respect of Protected Species:

- Advised to apply our Standing Advice to this application as it is a material consideration in the determination of applications in the same way as any individual response received from Natural England following consultation.

In respect of Local Sites:

- 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.

In respect of Biodiversity Enhancements:

- This application may provide opportunities to incorporate features into the design which are beneficial to wildlife, such as the incorporation of roosting opportunities for bats or the installation of bird nest boxes.
- The authority should consider securing measures to enhance the biodiversity of the site from the applicant, if it is minded to grant permission for this application. This is in accordance with Paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

In respect of Landscape Enhancements:

- This application may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably; and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green space provision and access to and contact with nature.

In respect of Sites of Special Scientific Interest Impact Risk Zones:

- The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 requires local planning authorities to consult Natural England on "Development in or likely to affect a Site of Special Scientific Interest" (Schedule 4, w). Our SSSI Impact Risk Zones are a GIS dataset designed to be used during the planning application validation process to help local planning authorities decide when to consult Natural England on developments likely to affect a SSSI.

23. Suffolk Wildlife Trust: **No objections** and the following advice provided:

In respect of Hedgerows and Woodland:

- Phase 1a/b has a hedgerow running through the centre of the site which has been identified as being 'Important' under the Hedgerow Regulations (1997). We note that this is to be retained as part of the green space of the development. This hedgerow should be protected and beneficially managed in accordance with the proposed Landscape and Ecological Management Plan.
- The development is adjacent to a small area of woodland, running east from Boyton Hall towards the A143. Whilst this woodland appears to be retained, we note that the Masterplan Layout drawing (ref. PH-125-02) shows an access road and footpath against the woodland boundary. It is important the woodland is suitably buffered and protected from any development works, and that it is ensured that no lighting/light spillage illuminates the woodland.

In respect of hazel Dormouse:

- We note the Hazel Dormouse Response (SES, Nov 2016), provided in relation to the potential presence of this species on the site. Whilst we agree with the ecological consultant's conclusion in relation to the potential impacts of the development of phase 1a/b on dormice, we consider that there is high potential for hazel dormice to be present across the wider north-west Haverhill development site. Whilst we note that dormice surveys were screened out of the assessment of the consented outline planning application (SE/09/1283/OUT), knowledge of the distribution and habitats used by this species in Suffolk has improved since the time of that application. Coupled with this, dormice have been recorded on the adjacent development site (north-east Haverhill). The wider north-west development site contains habitats suitable for hazel dormice and we therefore consider that it is essential that the wider north-west development site is surveyed for this species ahead of any further development phases being brought forward. The findings of such surveys should then be used to inform the detailed design of the development.

General comments:

- Request that the recommendations made within the ecological reports and Landscape and Ecological Management Plan are implemented in full, via a condition of planning consent, should permission be granted.

24. West Suffolk Tree Ecology and Landscape Officer: **Initial objections**, overcome through submission of amendments and further information

Summary of comments received 15<sup>th</sup> March 2017

- No information about the landscape treatment of the edge of Boyton Woods and the frontage of Haverhill Road. This is an important area in terms of protection of biodiversity.
- The hedgerow through the site is shown to be retained other than at three locations where narrow accesses are to be provided. These must be provided with the minimum of disruption to the existing habitat and a method statement and details including levels information will be required to ensure that the hedge is safeguarded.

- Plots 121-126 are located too close to the hedge and this relationship is likely to lead to pressure to over-manage the feature.
- The arboricultural plans are not included in the report and do not appear to have been submitted, it is therefore difficult to assess the impact of the layout on existing trees.
- The application is supported by an Ecological Scoping report dated December 2016. This recommends that a number of additional specialist surveys are undertaken, listed below. None of these surveys appear to have been included in the application information.
  - Tree scoping and / or aerial tree - inspections for roosting bats;
  - Great crested newt presence / absence leading to population class assessment if present;
  - Botanical survey;
  - Reptile survey;
  - Badger survey ;and
  - European hedgehog assessment.
- It is noted that the proposals, in general, are to develop agricultural land and hence the impact on biodiversity will be minimised, however the hedgerow track and ditch through the site form a significant natural feature and the proposals as submitted would affect this. The landscaping plan shows the existing vegetative cover including many shrubs to be removed and re-seeded with commercial wildflower mixes, amenity grassland and marginal mixes.
- It would be more appropriate to survey the existing vegetation cover in detail and manage this corridor – including the hedge and the ditch and the area between - to protect biodiversity including any protected species such as reptiles (which if present would be concentrated here). The existing track could be formalised by provision of the hoggin path as shown. The impact of the proposals is based on the principal that this hedge which has been identified to be important, ancient and species rich (appendix 3 of ecology study) is retained. Fragmentation of the feature will need to be avoided including (for access and for service easements) during the construction period– these should be planned at the eastern end of the hedge. Construction exclusion zone fencing will be required and this should be shown on the tree protection plan.
- The green corridor that forms the northern boundary to the site located to the south of the relief road must consider how it also relates to that road. Details of the planting along the road were included in application SE/09/1283. The concept and function of this green corridor is set out in section 4.9 of the Haverhill landscape strategy (prepared to accompany the outline planning application). It is not clear whether the space between the carriageway and the proposed development allows for the landscaping for both schemes and how these will tie together to provide the green corridor which is required as part of the ES.
- The function of the linear park east is also set out in section 4.9 of the Haverhill landscape strategy (prepared to accompany the outline planning application) as follows:
  - Preserve and protect the Local Wildlife Site;
  - Preserve the two ditches;

- Preserve the hedgerows and areas of scrub;
  - Create a green gateway into the town and the proposal site;
  - Provide informal open space close to people's homes;
  - Contain part of the SUD system;
  - Visually break up the areas of built form.
- The linear park is not intended to provide play provision. The location of this is clearly shown. This being the case it may be necessary to bring forward the formal play space to the west of this phase of development as part of this phase.
  - In detail the following principles should also be noted.
    - The site entrance is worthy of a landscape feature (which could be simply provided with planting) – the current treatment is bland
    - The base of SUDs should slope slightly to create permanently soggy point if possible
    - Lighting needs to be shown on the landscape plans to ensure that they are consistent with tree locations – lighting to avoid sensitive features such as the hedge/ditch
    - The connectivity between the north and south of the main road is poor
    - Amenity grass should be avoided except in formal play space – use formal lawn or wildflower mixes
    - There should be a barrier (knee rail /planting/bollards) between roads and green space to prevent access onto POS by vehicles
    - On the north side of the road place the small grass verge next to the hedge – on its own it is not viable

Additional comments following further information:

- Continued lack of information in relation to landscape treatment of Boyton Wood. The landscape strategy approved as part of the outline scheme shows the existing woodland to have an easement. The assessment of the impact of the proposals on bats is dependent on the retention of the woodland edge, and no other assessment of the removal of woodland is included in the biodiversity study. Previous bat survey indicates that this woodland edge is used by common pipistrelle, Barbastelle and Brown long-eared bats. If woodland is to be removed, its loss would need to be compensated.
- The hedge has been identified as a Local Wildlife site and also as an 'Important' and 'Ancient and/or species rich' hedge in the ES Appendix 8.1, table 3.2, page 20 and figure 3.2. This is not picked up in the ecology report.
- The layout and the TPP are inconsistent so it is unclear how the new properties relate to the hedge
- relating to woodland W54, which incidentally is largely outside of the red line, the details submitted do not appear to be sufficiently accurate or detailed to give assurance the existing trees will be adequately protected. The tree protection plan is not consistent with the layout plan.
- The space for the green landscape corridor on the north is now reserved however there are no revised landscape drawings.

## Comments 1<sup>st</sup> June

- I note that the proposals are now not to remove any woodland trees however that does not change the fact that the homes in the south west corner of the site are too close to the woodland trees such that: the required easement for bats is not retained; the amenity of the properties would be affected by the overshadowing; and there is the potential for future resentment to lead to the deterioration of the woodland in the future.
- Neither the tree protection plan or the landscape plan show the intention to retain and protect the local wildlife site throughout the construction period and to enhance the habitat such that it will continue provide a landscape feature in the future. The scale of fencing that I would envisage to be appropriate is on the attached scanned plan. Details of the path construction and method of construction could be left to condition – I would envisage that these would be completed towards the end of the build as part of the landscaping scheme. The protection of the LWS is a key requirement and more certainty about its protection is required. I note the point that the paths use the gaps in the hedge and this is welcomed.

25. Sport England: **No comments.**

26. Environment Agency: **No comments.** Advised to consult Lead Local Flood Authority.

27. Suffolk County Council Floods Team: **Holding Objection.**

Summary of comments dated 13<sup>th</sup> February:

- SCC will require full details of the SuDS provision for the site as per our local guidance.

Summary of comments dated 16<sup>th</sup> May:

- Until such time that SCC Floods have seen a drainage strategy, with supporting hydraulic calculations, then we are not comfortable in approving the latest layout. This is so we can be sure the building layout and drainage complement each other.
- The site layout has to demonstrate that there is enough space provided to house SuDS, this is so that the site does not flood during storms up to 1 in100yr + CC event. SCC will need to see hydraulic calcs to demonstrate this. Fortunately the position and location of SuDS within the layout is acceptable.
- The building layout should allow for natural corridors to allow stormwater to find its natural path towards SuDS features. For example Block 179-184 may intervene with exceedance flows during extreme storms when stormwater will flow towards basins.
- Currently without any evidence to suggest otherwise, SCC deem the lower parts of the northern plot (more specifically plots 57, 116 -119) at potential risk of flooding. Likewise on the southern plot the area next to the proposed SuDS lagoon (plots 179-184) are the same. SCC recommend that these

lower parts of the site should be open spaces (with SuDS integrated into them) so that they mimic natural drainage processes.

- Also it would be useful to overlay SuDS layout with site landscaping so that we can be sure both will complement each other. SuDS and existing watercourses are an integral part to the landscaping and should be clearly shown on the latest layout plans.

Summary of comments received 20<sup>th</sup> June 2017:

I've reviewed the latest drainage documents from Persimmon and I still have some concerns that need addressing, thus my holding objection still applies.

Specific Points:-

- Where has the final 7l/s outflow rate from the basins come from? These rates differ to the outline drainage strategy by Capita Symonds which are based on catchment size. Hydrological calcs should be submitted in support of the hydraulic calcs.
- Max Water Depths in basins – as per out local standards and national guidance any basin within public open space cannot have a depth of water greater than 0.5m at all times. This is to protect people (mainly toddlers) that will use the POS. Currently this is not the case as some basins have water depths over 1m. The LPA are unlikely to accept these basins being fenced off, therefore they will need to be revised. Section drawings would also be useful to confirm side slopes (should be 1 in 4).
- Submission of an impermeable areas plan is required to cross reference with the hydraulic calcs.
- Submission of an exceedance plan that shows safe corridors for runoff during events in excess of the drainage system or blockages.
- There is no reference to the swale along the north eastern boundary in the Northern Plot. What is the function of this SuDS and where does it convey too?
- Interception Storage – there should be a provision in the basins or swales to absorb the first 5mm of rainfall over the site? This is too treat pollutants during concentrated flows at the onset of a storm. So far I cannot see any evidence that this is being provided.

28. West Suffolk Environment Team: **No objections** and made the following comments:

- Land contamination is a matter that should be dealt with through a discharge of conditions application rather than the reserved matters application. Despite this, the applicant has submitted a land contamination assessment, and therefore this Service has made the below comments, which may be of use prior to the submission of the discharge of conditions application.
- Actions required prior to the Geosphere Report being accepted are as follows:
  - Report needs to be final (not draft)
  - Exploratory Hole Location Plan needs to show actual locations of exploratory holes rather than the proposed locations

- Confirmation is required that the rifle range has been targeted, or if not, recommendations for further investigations provided.

29. Suffolk Archaeology: **No objections** and made the following comments:

- High potential for encountering additional archaeological deposits at this location and the archaeology which has been defined within the evaluation merits further investigation prior to development. Groundworks associated with the development will damage or destroy surviving archaeological remains.
- No grounds to consider refusal of permission in order to achieve preservation in situ of any important heritage assets. However, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 141), any permission granted should be the subject of a planning condition to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage asset before it is damaged or destroyed.

### **Representations:**

30. Haverhill Town Council **Objection**.

Comments made at Haverhill Town Council's Planning Meeting 7<sup>th</sup> February 2017 regarding DC/16/2836/RM:

Whilst remaining supportive of the NW Haverhill Development, Haverhill Town Council has a number of concerns about the detailed plans in this application. It therefore OBJECTS to this application on the following grounds:

Density and Parking – the Developer has labelled various first floor rooms as 'offices' rather than bedrooms. Some of these offices are as big as other bedrooms in the property and across the whole range, the smallest 'office' is still bigger than the smallest room labelled as a bedroom. We believe this arbitrary re-labelling of rooms is intended to reduce the number of parking spaces required per plot, when following the Suffolk Parking Guidance. We have examined the plans and, whilst they are very complicated, the evidence appears to bear this out. In addition, some plots have parking three-deep (plot 110) which is not acceptable or practical. Our measurements also called into question the width of the internal garages on some house types. These did not meet the 7x3m requirement under the parking guide.

We are concerned about the risk of on-road parallel parking blocking nose-in spaces and potentially causing difficulties for emergency and service vehicles as well as being a potential cause of ongoing neighbour disputes. We believe that under-provision of parking in order to pack in houses is a false economy. We note the proposal by Persimmon for residents permit parking. Such schemes are normally associated with a lack of parking spaces in areas of Victorian terraces. To propose this as a solution to any parking difficulties before the estate is even built is a tacit admission of failure of intent to provide sufficient parking in the first place.

We are pleased that Persimmon's representative at our meeting agreed to go away and check that all the plots have acceptable parking provision with the

offices counted as bedrooms and undertook to ensure the development conforms fully with the Suffolk Parking Guide.

Electric Vehicle Points – We understand that the Great Wilsey development in NE Haverhill has a requirement upon it to provide charging points. The same obligation does not appear to be placed upon this development

Surface Drainage - We are disappointed to be consulted on this application ahead of the submission by SCC Flood Officers on the SUDS proposals required for this development. Flooding is an issue and in the absence of a report stating otherwise, we take the view that the necessary flood mitigation measures are insufficient for this development and object on the grounds of insufficient flood mitigation for surface run-off and treatment of existing watercourses on the site.

Highways – We would like Persimmon, as a goodwill gesture, to bring forward the commencement of the relief road. Whilst this will be an excellent stance from a PR viewpoint, it will also resolve issues around construction traffic management, even if the new road is not given its final surface and just used for construction traffic alone.

Conditions - Notwithstanding our above objections, we request that conditions are set in respect on the construction phase. These should be to:

- prevent unnecessary disturbance to residents in Ann Suckling Way;
- avoid deliveries during times of peak school traffic (Wrattling Road/Chalkstone Way junction is a problem already, without lorries adding to the risk of poor air quality); and,
- Provide a wheel wash well inside the site boundary so that no mud is brought onto the road, as this is a very heavy clay area.

To conclude, we do not feel that resolving any of these objections should prove insurmountable for Persimmon to achieve. We would also add that the general design of the proposed buildings and layout (bar the density and parking) are welcomed. We anticipate being able to withdraw our objections following amendments and reassurances being received.

Comments made at Haverhill Town Council's Planning Meeting 7th February 2017 regarding DC/17/0048/FUL:

The Council OBJECTS to this planning application for change of use to form 2 access points onto the Wrattling Road/Haverhill Road. The objection is on the following grounds:

Highways – Concern over the safety of the arrangement outside plots 193/4 where a shared driveway from a number of homes crosses the pavement. This pavement being the footway from the new development to Samuel Ward Academy, it is dangerous to have emerging traffic on what is a non-protected crossing. These houses should have an access which joins the highway inside the development.

Highways – Concern over the safety of traffic emerging from the proposed new access road onto the Haverhill Road opposite Wrattling Croft. Traffic leaving the new roundabout heading south will be accelerating towards this point and therefore drivers of vehicles emerging from the new access road will find it very difficult to accurately judge the speed of approach of these oncoming vehicles. There will also be issues about southbound traffic wishing to turn



right into the new access road causing delays potentially backing up to the roundabout. This may be exacerbated by the proximity of this proposed access road to Ann Suckling Road, so two sets of cars waiting to turn right will cause issues.

Highways – Concern over the additional vehicles joining the Haverhill Road. Original plans had these joining at the new roundabout so that traffic heading West would turn immediately onto the relief road. This alternative proposal means this traffic will join the northbound queue of vehicles at the new roundabout. This needs to be modelled. The original plan to have a minor link road from the Southern estate to the main spine crossing the new linear park would be relatively quiet as far as traffic volume and speed would be concerned presenting little difficulty in providing pedestrian crossing servicing the park. Given the minor inconvenience this original proposal offers it seems a better a far better option than this amended proposal. It would also resolve the issue of the driveway crossing as there would be no need for houses fronting the Haverhill Road to access directly onto it.

Highways – Concern over the vision splays provided for the new access road. This needs to be suitable for the actual speed of traffic on this road, which we believe is significantly higher than the legal limit. The new tree planting shown on the Haverhill Road would impinge on the vision of emerging traffic.

Highways – Ann Suckling Road junction's vision splay and entrance need revision to slow down traffic turning into it and to ensure maximum safety. Whilst on the edge of the development, the proposals for the development impact the safety of this.

The Council would like to express its disappointment that we were required to comment on this application before the highways report, vital to the consideration of the application, was available.

Comments made at Haverhill Town Council's Planning Committee 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2017 regarding DC/16/2836/RM:

The Town Council notes that some of the concerns previously raised have been addressed, specifically welcoming the reduced density to 200 dwellings, transparency in regard to the number of bedrooms and improved site layout and parking. However, the Town Council's previous objection still stands in respect of increased traffic emerging from the proposed new access road, between Anne Suckling Road and the new proposed roundabout, onto Haverhill Road.

In addition, the allocated parking for plots 116 & 117 appear too remote from the dwellings, necessitating a long walk on foot to those plots which may encourage on-street parking on the access road very close to the proposed roundabout. This should be addressed before permission is granted.

31. Public Representations:

DC/16/2836/RM.

104 nearby addresses notified and site notice posted. 5 representations received (4 of which were objections) raising the points summarised below (full representations are available to view as part of the planning file online):

### *Character/design/layout*

- Phase 1 should be low density/executive housing in the greater interests of Haverhill and the surrounding area, balancing the town with a broader range of housing.
- Query density of dwellings being higher than described by excluding green buffer zones. It is higher than indicated at the outline.
- Insufficient green space within the housing blocks.
- Houses on Ann Suckling Road in stark contrast to size of houses currently there.

### *Trees/open space/landscape*

- The green buffer between Boyton Wood and development indicated at the outline stage has been omitted.
- Proposed works contradict the woodland management plan.
- In the southwest corner of the southern plot the houses are built up to the woodland edge. Do these houses and gardens extend outside the development boundaries. Will this proximity impact the insurability of these houses. Plot 130 has proposed garden gate access for wheelie bins at the far end of the garden in the woodland edge.

### *Highways/parking*

- Parking spaces insufficient in number and some cases visibility.
- Housing in Ann Suckling Road have stacked parking with no visibility spays for neighbours leading to more parking on road.
- Concern over the increased traffic on Haverhill Road/Wratting Road during the construction stage of this development and thereafter..... some sort of roundabout/traffic lights should be installed at the Ann Suckling Road junction –
- Many points were raised at the Haverhill Town Council meeting which I attended and I can see the Council have also raised concerns regarding some points – including additional traffic and the impact on existing residents adjacent to the site.
- Another issue which the Haverhill council have also raised is parking along the main road/Ann Suckling Road by residents of the Victorian terrace opposite as houses of that age do not necessarily have allocated parking areas
- No comment has been received as to any improvement or change to the Ann Suckling Road/Haverhill/Wratting road junction which I feel is important
- The town council have raised concern and suggested the “Northern bypass” be constructed in readiness for the proposed development. Why can this not be seriously considered/implemented? This to most people would be an obvious plan in readiness for development which I am sure will be ongoing for quite some time. To disregard the additional amount of traffic using what is already a busy road is not taking into account the existing residents nearby the proposed development area and I would urge the Council to consider this issue again before allowing this to go ahead.

### *Residential Amenity*

- Dismayed to see the tallest properties 2 ½ stories on the rear boundary of properties in Boyton Woods. Sure they could be elsewhere to cause as little loss of privacy as possible to existing properties.

### *Other Matters*

- No account of existing rights of way enjoyed over the land as access to Boyton Hall and no provision to retain the existing vehicular access across the land in its current position.
- Existing access arrangements to Boyton Hall removed – no discussion with owner on this point
- Access and rights of way over the land are required to repair and maintain a public utility (police radio mast and ancillary buildings. Has consultation been made with Suffolk Constabulary on this issue?
- The plans appear to extend over the existing boundary of Boyton hall and of the dwellings of Boyton Woods and make reference to the clearing of woodland which is not in the applicant's ownership.
- Insufficient wheelie bin routes leading to bins at the front of houses.
- No connection for housing on Ann Suckling Road to drainage and main sewer.
- There is already some concern about air quality along Withersfield Road and this can only increase with construction traffic coming through the town to the development site.

#### DC/17/20048/FUL

16 nearby addresses notified and site notice posted. 2 representations received (in addition to those received in relation to DC/16/2836/RM) raising the points summarised below (full representations are available to view as part of the planning file online):

- The access should be slightly further away from Haverhill, opposite the wood between the "Fox " and "Wratting Croft" where there is already a track, as otherwise it will impact on the homes on the south side of Haverhill Road in terms of noise and light.
- The layout of proposed plots 199-203 will result in increased on-road parking in Anne Sucklings Lane as well as cars backing in and out of private drives close to the junction with Haverhill Road.
- Not sufficient parking spaces are planned for proposed plots 169-192. The proposed removal of the slip road will further reduce the available on-street parking spaces on Haverhill Road.
- DC/15/2430/FUL approved 2 access roads either side of Wratting Croft which will further increase the number of cars joining Haverhill Road. The increase in required parking spaces and the reduction in available spaces will result in parked cars along Haverhill Road blocking visibility when leaving Ann Sucklings Lane as well as the proposed new entry roads opposite Greenslade House and Wratting Croft. Speed limits are routinely ignored on Haverhill Road. The combined effect of DC/15/2430, DC/16/2836 and DC/17/0048 will create an accident black spot.

## **Policy:**

32. The following policies of the Joint Development Management Policies Document and the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy December 2010 have been taken into account in the consideration of this application:

### Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015:

- Policy DM1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- Policy DM2 Creating Places Development Principles and Local Distinctiveness
- Policy DM3 Masterplans
- Policy DM6 Flooding and Sustainable Drainage
- Policy DM7 Sustainable Design and Construction
- Policy DM10 Impact of Development on Sites of Biodiversity and Geodiversity Importance
- Policy DM11 Protected Species
- Policy DM12 Mitigation, Enhancement, Management and Monitoring of Biodiversity
- Policy DM13 Landscape Features
- Policy DM14 Protecting and Enhancing Natural Resources, Minimising Pollution and Safeguarding from Hazards
- Policy DM20 Archaeology
- Policy DM42 Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities
- Policy DM44 Rights of Way
- Policy DM45 Transport Assessments and Travel Plans

### Haverhill Vision 2031

- Vision Policy HV1 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- Vision Policy HV2 - Housing Development within Haverhill
- Vision Policy HV3 - Strategic Site - North-West Haverhill
- Vision Policy HV4 - Strategic Site - North-East Haverhill
- Vision Policy HV8 - New and Existing Local Centres and Community Facilities
- Vision Policy HV12 - Haverhill North-West Relief Road
- Vision Policy HV18 - Green Infrastructure in Haverhill

### St Edmundsbury Core Strategy December 2012

- Core Strategy Policy CS1 - St Edmundsbury Spatial Strategy
- Core Strategy Policy CS2 - Sustainable Development
- Core Strategy Policy CS3 - Design and Local Distinctiveness
- Core Strategy Policy CS4 - Settlement Hierarchy and Identity
- Core Strategy Policy CS5 - Affordable Housing
- Core Strategy Policy CS7 - Sustainable Transport
- Core Strategy Policy CS8 - Strategic Transport Improvements
- Core Strategy Policy CS12 - Haverhill Strategic Growth

## **Other Planning Policy:**

33. National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

## **Officer Comment:**

34. The subsequent section of the report discusses whether the development proposed by this application can be considered acceptable in principle, in the

light of extant national and local planning policies and previous consents. It then address the main areas of consideration, which are:

- Design, layout and visual amenity;
- Residential Amenity
- Accessibility and sustainable transport links and impact on the highway network;
- Open space, landscaping and drainage.
- Trees and Ecology;

#### Principle of Development

35. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that applications are determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The St. Edmundsbury Development Plan is comprised of the adopted Core Strategy, the three Vision 2031 Area Action Plans and the adopted Joint Development Management Policies Document. National planning policies set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained at its heart are also a key material consideration.
36. The principle of development here has been established through the allocation of 138 hectares of land in policy HV4 of the Haverhill Vision 2031, latterly confirmed through the granting of outline consent SE/09/1283. At the same time as the outline consent, full planning permission was also granted for the construction of a relief road and associated works.
37. The outline permission was accompanied by a series of parameter plans which established the extent of land for development, the distribution of uses, building scales and densities, land for open space and landscaping, access routes and the level of affordable housing. An S106 agreement associated with the outline approval secured the level and timing of financial contributions and other infrastructure.
38. The density parameter plan established the principle of a density of between 35 and 45 dwellings per hectare (dph) for the majority of this phase of the development, with a lower density of below 35 dph on the eastern edge of the southern parcel and the development along Ann Suckling Road. The development proposed in this application is in general conformity with the established density parameters, with a proposed density of 40 dph on the northern parcel, 33.7 dph on the southern parcel and 31.0 dph along Ann Suckling Road.
39. The land use and landscape parameter plans identified three parcels of residential development as shown in the submitted application. A central linear park was identified as the principal open space for this phase along with a green corridor along the northern relief road and a further green buffer along the edge of Boyton Wood. The proposed scheme is considered to be in general conformity with these broad parameters.
40. In terms of the distribution of development and open spaces and the scale and density of the proposed dwelling, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in principle.

41. In terms of access arrangements, the outline consent established a single point of access from the roundabout on the proposed northern relief Road. The current proposal seeks approval for a second access from Haverhill Road, serving the southern parcel of development. As this falls outside the scope of the outline consent, a separate full planning application has been submitted alongside the reserved matters.
42. The absence of a secondary access to the development within the masterplan and outline consent does preclude the provision of such an access in principle. It is considered that the provision of this access does not prejudice the ability of the development to meet the established parameters and this aspect of the overall scheme should therefore be assessed on its own merits against relevant development plan policies and material considerations.
43. In assessing the detail of the proposals, the design principles established in the masterplan are an important consideration, as are other relevant development plan policies.

#### Design, Layout and Visual Amenity

44. Development Management Policy DM2 states that proposals for all development should create a sense of place and/or local character. In the case of residential schemes, Policy DM22 states that proposals should create a coherent and legible place that is structured and articulated so that it is visually interesting and welcoming. New dwellings should be of high architectural quality and should function well, providing adequate space, light and privacy.
45. The NPPF stresses the importance the Government attaches to the design of the built environment, confirming good design as a key aspect of sustainable development, indivisible from good planning. The Framework goes on to reinforce these statements by confirming that planning permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.
46. The Framework also advises that although visual appearance and the architecture of individual buildings are very important factors, securing high quality and inclusive design goes beyond aesthetic considerations. Therefore, planning decisions should address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment.
47. Condition B7 of the outline consent required the submission of a Site Wide Design Code with the first submission of Reserved Matters, to develop and interpret the approved parameter plans, building on the principles established within the masterplan.
48. The submitted Design Code has been the subject of considerable discussion with relevant officers and an amended document has been produced, which Officers feel better reflects both the principles and aspirations of the masterplan. The Design Code would form one of the approved documents as part of the approval of the reserved matters application and would be used to guide the design of future phases of the development.

49. This application falls within the character area described as Wratting Gardens in the final Design Code. This area is characterised by a traditional approach to layout design, architecture and boundary treatment. It states that designs here should take references from the traditional details and finishes found in Haverhill and the boundary treatments should be more rural in character including open frontages, low timber fencing and hedges.
50. A number of revisions have been made to the detailed design and layout during the course of the application to improve the overall quality and appearance of the development. As a result of this, the initially proposed 203 dwellings have been reduced to 200, as set out in the current description of development.
51. The revised layout seeks to provide a range of design solutions for parking. Whilst the majority of parking is still provided on-plot, the number of parking courts has been increased, to further reduce the visual impact of frontage parking, which previously dominated the scheme. These areas have been carefully designed to form part of the pedestrian street network, being permeable where possible and benefiting from natural surveillance through the siting of houses fronting onto or framing these streets. It is considered that the reduction in frontage parking has greatly improved the townscape and quality of the built environment.
52. The private drive which originally ran parallel to the east/west spine road has been removed as part of the amendments to the layout. This has enabled the creation of deeper front gardens and on plot parking between dwellings behind the building line, enabling the provision of additional street trees on the northern side of the linear park. This has created a more attractive green frontage, which better compliments the open space running through the middle of the scheme, creating an attractive green route into the development.
53. A gateway feature of dwellings at the eastern of the northern parcel has been created to create a better sense of arrival and stronger definition to this edge of the development, which marks an important and prominent location. The development has also been set further back from the junction to allow for additional formal landscaping, including statement trees.
54. In the southern parcel, the road running parallel with the southern boundary has been moved further away from the edge of Boyton Woods, providing greater separation and allowing the introduction of a green sward between the road and the retained woodland. The amount of road along this green edge of the development has also been reduced with plots 139, 134-145, 160-162 now having the benefit of parking to the rear.
55. The revised Design Code for the whole site envisages this part of the scheme as broadly traditional in appearance. Alterations to the house types were requested to better reflect local vernacular architecture and better create a sense of place distinctive to this development. As a result of the amendments, more variety has been introduced to the house types, with detailing to create a more bespoke development more in line with the requirements of policy DM2.
56. It is acknowledged that here are still standard developer house typologies within the development and Officers have sought to secure enhanced levels of layout and detailing on those areas that are most prominent within the scheme and which would add the greatest value to the overall character of the area. On balance, it is considered that subject to securing appropriate materials and

detailing via conditions, the overall character and appearance is acceptable and in broad accordance with Development Plan Policies and the adopted Masterplan.

### Residential Amenity

57. The protection of residential amenity is a key component of good design. The Framework states (as part of its design policies) that good planning should contribute positively to making places better for people. The Framework also states that planning decisions should aim inter alia to avoid noise from giving rise to significant adverse effects on health and quality of life as a result of new development.
58. Policy DM2 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document also seeks to safeguard inter alia residential amenity from potentially adverse effects of new development.
59. It is considered that, following amendments to the design and layout, all residents of the proposed development will enjoy an acceptable level of residential amenity. Garden sizes are considered to be adequate and the positioning and scale of dwellings is such that there would be no unacceptable levels of overlooking or overbearing impacts. Appropriate boundary treatments to safeguard the amenity of future occupants would be secured through the use of a condition.
60. Some concerns were raised by the Public Health and Housing Officer regarding the potential for noise impacts on future occupants within this phase from traffic noise. In response to these concerns an additional noise survey and Acoustic Design Advice report were submitted. The report concludes that adequate noise levels can be achieved through design details and Officers are satisfied that suitable levels of amenity can be achieved in relation to noise, subject to the use of conditions to secure acoustic insulation of the dwellings in accordance with BS 8233:2014.
61. Concerns have been raised in public representations regarding the impact of the proposed development on existing neighbouring dwellings.
62. In terms of noise and disturbance from additional traffic, the number of dwellings to be accommodated on the site has already been established in the outline consent and the addition of a further access point would not materially increase or alter the likely impact from traffic to neighbouring dwellings.
63. In terms of the potential overlooking or overbearing impacts, it is considered there is sufficient separation between the proposed dwellings and the existing neighbours is such that there would be no unacceptable adverse effects residential amenity.

### Accessibility, Sustainable Transport and Impact on the Highway Network

64. The NPPF emphasises the need for the transport system 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.

65. Policy DM2 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document requires that new development should produce designs that accord with standards and maintain or enhance the safety of the highway network. Policy DM45 sets out criteria for the submission of Transport Assessments and Travel Plans to accompany planning applications whilst Policy DM46 addresses parking standards.
66. Both the outline permission and the original masterplan made provision for a single point of vehicular access from Haverhill Road, via the roundabout. However, in this proposal the southern parcel of dwellings would be served by a vehicular access from Haverhill Road. This part of the scheme and the pedestrian and cycle link within that highway verge is the subject of a separate full planning application alongside the reserved matters application.
67. As previously discussed, the fact that something is not contained within the masterplan does not necessarily mean that it would be unacceptable in principle. Indeed, it would be counterproductive for a masterplan to prevent an evolution of the design where that evolution would create a better built environment. In this case, the provision of a secondary access enables the linear park to become a car-free space without the need for it to be dissected by a vehicular link between the northern and southern parcels. This is seen as being beneficial in terms of the quality of that space both ecologically and in terms of the way in which it would function as an attractive and usable public space.
68. The Town Council has raised concerns over the safety of a further access from Haverhill Road and this has been echoed in some public representations. The application has been amended so that now only a single point of access is proposed, with no additional private drives. The Highways Officer has not raised any highway safety concerns in relation to the provision a single additional point of access as shown on the amended plans and as such it is considered to be acceptable in highway safety terms and in accordance with development Plan policy.
69. The developer has worked with the Highways Officer to revise the layout and road hierarchy to ensure that it meets the County's requirements in all respects. Amendments were also sought to ensure that the transition between the traditional street and shared surfaced streets accords with the Suffolk design Guide. The Highways Officer has reviewed the amended plans and has confirmed that subject to some final points of detail being addressed, they are satisfied that the proposal is acceptable subject to the use of conditions.
70. The outline application contained an illustrative access parameter plan detailing and expanding the footpath network. The expanded network followed key desire lines and the network of green spaces. The submitted Design Code proposes that formal footway and cycle way routes will follow the principal routes within the development and this can be seen on the primary street that runs along the north of the linear park in this phase of the development, where there is a 4 metres wide cycleway/footway along the southern edge of the road adjacent to the public open space.

71. Clarification was sought as to the provision of crossing points along this Primary Street and two crossing points are now detailed along this road. It is envisaged that these would be raised tables in order to facilitate crossing and act to restrain vehicle speeds. The Highways Officer has advised that they would require a formal crossing point here, which would be secured by condition.
72. Further pedestrian routes along the eastern edge of the development adjacent to Haverhill Road, the northern side along the green corridor adjacent to the bypass and through the linear park create opportunities for circular routes within the development as well as connecting to the network that will come forward with the subsequent phases of the development and ultimately with the wider public network.
73. The quantum of parking proposed is consistent with the Suffolk Guidance for Parking 2015, that being: 1 space for 1-bed dwellings; 1.5 spaces for 2-bed dwellings; 2 spaces for 3-bed dwellings; 3 spaces for 4-bed dwellings; and; 1 visitor space for every 4 homes.
74. A number of the house types indicate a dedicated study, which the developer does not consider to be big enough to function as a bedroom. Concerns were raised with regards to house type H as a 3-bedroom property as the study had an internal area of 6.25m<sup>2</sup>. To address this, a revised layout has provided for this house type, with an additional third parking space in accordance with the standard for a four bedroom property. House type L had a similar sized study to the H type and in response to officer comments the internal arrangement for this house type has been reviewed reducing the study to 3.6m<sup>2</sup> so that this room would not function as a bedroom and would not generate the need for an additional parking space.
75. The NPPF directs that applications should only be refused on transport grounds if the residential cumulative impacts of the development are severe. In this case, the proposed highway works, including the provision of a secondary vehicular access to the development outside the scope of the original outline application, are considered to present a safe and sustainable provision. The level of parking is considered to be acceptable the street hierarchy and pedestrian and cycle routes within the site are considered to be in accordance with the aims of the masterplan and development plan policies and will ensure that this first phase is well connected and accessible for pedestrians and cyclists.

#### Open space, landscaping drainage

76. The Masterplan and Design Code identify the linear park as the key area of open space within this phase of the development. The revised layout, which creates a green frontage to the north of the park, and the proposed additional access from Haverhill Road, which removes the need for this space to be bisected by a highway, further enhances the value that this open space will add to the character of the wider development.
77. The intended function of the linear park has previously been set out in the landscape strategy (prepared to accompany the outline planning application) as follows:
  - Preserve and protect the Local Wildlife Site;
  - Preserve the two ditches;

- Preserve the hedgerows and areas of scrub;
- Create a green gateway into the town and the proposal site;
- Provide informal open space close to people's homes;
- Contain part of the SUD system;
- Visually break up the areas of built form.

78. In respect of this part of the scheme, amendments have been sought to the landscaping plans to ensure that the functions set out above are met and the current natural corridor, that forms the backbone of the linear park, is retained and enhanced with as little fragmentation as possible.
79. It is proposed that the existing track be formalised by provision of a surfaced path. However, Officers do not want to see the provision of formal play equipment within this space due to the lack of natural surveillance, safety concerns with the proximity of the Primary Road to the north and the issues regarding maintenance in this area. The developer has undertaken to revise the plans to reinstate this as a natural space which will in itself present play opportunities through imaginative use of the natural landscape.
80. There will be an opportunity for more formal play provision in the next phase of the development, as indicated in the Masterplan and Design Code, on the edge of the playing fields. This would be well placed to serve the dwellings set out in this application in a well supervised and safe location that accords with the open space strategy submitted with the outline application.
81. The other key area of open space within this phase of the development is the green corridor at the north of the site adjacent to the landscape buffer for the approved bypass. The plans have been amended to have regard to the landscape plans for the buffer submitted at the outline stage and to better reflect the aims of the masterplan and landscape strategy submitted with the outline application.
82. Further changes to the green corridor have been requested, through the introduction of more substantial planting and bigger blocks of native species. The developer has undertaken to make these changes to the plan. In addition, Officers have also requested that all areas of public open space be either floral lawn or wildflower mix and hedges to be mixed native species which would be more resilient, of biodiversity benefit and would be more fitting with the character envisaged for this more rural edge of the development.
83. A further key function of the open spaces within the development is to accommodate the SUDS features necessary to adequately meet the surface water drainage needs of the development.
84. The County Flood Officer has reviewed the latest drainage documents and still has concerns that need addressing in relation to clarifying hydrological calculations, reducing the depth of standing water in the basins in the worst case events, demonstration of safe corridors for runoff during events in excess of the drainage system or blockages, clarification on the purpose of the northern swale and details of interception storage to treat pollutants during concentrated flows at the onset of a storm.
85. These concerns will need to be addressed before any consent for the development can be issued and as such the recommendation set out in this

report is subject to this matter being satisfactorily resolved and the current holding objection being removed.

86. Subject to the submission of amended landscape plans to address the points raised by officers and subject to the use of conditions to secure appropriate on-plot soft landscaping, it is considered that the landscaping scheme is an acceptable one, that will enhance the character of the development, provide opportunities for informal play and recreation and will enhance biodiversity.

#### Trees and ecology.

87. The NPPF confirms the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural environment by minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains where possible. This is reflected in policy DM12 which states that measures should be included in the design of all developments for the protection of biodiversity, the mitigation of any adverse impacts and enhancements commensurate with the scale of the development.
88. Given that the site is predominantly agricultural land, the impact on biodiversity will be minimised. However, the hedgerow track and ditch through the site form a significant natural feature, which should be retained and managed. The hedge has been identified as a Local Wildlife site and is marked as an 'Important' and 'Ancient and/or species rich' hedge in the Environmental Statement which accompanied the original outline application.
89. As discussed in relation to open space, amendments have been sought to the landscaping plans to ensure that this natural corridor is retained and enhanced with as little fragmentation as possible. The tree protections plans also now show adequate levels of protective fencing to ensure this feature is protected throughout construction works.
90. The amendment to the layout of the scheme has afforded greater separation between the houses and Boyton Woods and has reduced the extent of roadway bounding the woods. In addition, a Report submitted regarding the lighting design details the measures undertaken to avoid light spill. It also details how the lighting strategy has had regard to bat sensitive areas. In addition to LED lighting, front and rear shields can be fitted to luminaires close to sensitive areas (such as Boyton Wood) to further reduce light spillage.
91. The concerns of the Trees and Ecology Officer, with regards to species surveys have been addressed and additional information, including lighting details, has satisfied the concerns regarding the potential impact on bats.
92. On balance it is considered that the revised scheme makes good provision to retain biodiversity features, safeguard protected species and enhance biodiversity across the site. It is therefore considered to be in accordance with development plan policies and the guidance contained within the NPPF.

#### **Other matters**

##### Affordable housing:

93. The application proposes 30% affordable housing in line with the requirements of the outline consent and accompanying S106. The requirement equates to

60 homes within this phase and this comprises a mix of 20 intermediate and 41 affordable rented dwellings. The scheme is supported by the Strategic Housing Officer.

#### Archaeology:

94. The County archaeology team has highlighted that the proposed development lies in an area of known archaeology and has requested pre-commencement conditions to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage asset before it is damaged or destroyed. This is a matter of principle that relates to the grant of the outline permission and in this regard a condition requiring a programme of archaeological work for each phase of the development was attached to the outline consent and the consent for the relief road.

#### Electric Car Charging Points

95. The Town Council has highlighted that the North East Haverhill development Great Wilsey Park has a requirement to provide charging points. This is a matter that must be addressed and secured by condition at the outline stage as it does not relate to the matters of detailed to be provided at the reserved matters stage. No such condition was attached to the outline application relating to this development and it would not be appropriate to attach such a condition at this stage.

#### **Conclusion:**

96. The development proposal has been considered against Development Plan Policies and the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and the government's agenda for growth.
97. The principle of the development is in accord with the policies within the development plan and has, in the case of the reserved matters application, been confirmed in the earlier outline application.
98. A number of revisions have been made to the scheme to address the concerns of Officers and improve the overall design and layout of the proposal. The amended proposals allow for good quality natural open space and soft landscaping to reinforce the more rural feel within this part of the wider strategic site whilst also improving biodiversity and enabling sustainable drainage of the development. The development proposed is permeable with good accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists creating, circular routes within this phase and connectivity as the next phases come forward. The design and appearance of individual dwellings has been improved to introduce local design features and the development will provide for an acceptable level of residential amenity and parking for future occupants.
99. Subject to the receipt of final amendments, there are no highway safety issues that cannot be addressed through the use of conditions, both in respect of the reserved matters application and the full application for the access.
100. Both applications are therefore recommended for approval, subject to the conditions set out below:

**Recommendation:**

- 101 It is recommended that planning permission and reserved matters be **APPROVED** subject to conditions and subject to the drainage concerns being satisfactorily overcome and the final agreement of the site wide Design Code.

***A full list of planning conditions will be circulated as late papers prior to the Development Control Committee meeting on 6 July 2017.***

**Documents:**

All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online [DC/16/2836/RM](http://DC/16/2836/RM)