



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

DEV/SE/17/036

Development Control Committee 7 September 2017

Planning Application DC/17/0595/RM - Development Zones I, K and L, Marham Park, Bury St Edmunds

Date	22 March 2017	Expiry Date:	21 June 2017
Registered:		EOT:	TBC
Case Officer:	Charles Judson	Recommendation:	Approve
Parish:	Bury St Edmunds	Ward:	Fornham
Proposal:	Reserved Matters Application - Submission of details under DC/13/0932/HYB for details of access, scale, layout, appearance, landscaping and parking for Development Zones I, K and L for 180 dwellings Including Details Reserved by Conditions C19, C20, C21, C22, C23, C30, C31, C35, C36 and C37 of application DC/13/0932/HYB		
Site:	Development Zones I, K and L, Marham Park, Bury St Edmunds		
Applicant:	Mr Sean Marten - BDW Eastern Counties		

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:

This application is referred to the Development Control Committee because the application is a Major application and the Officer recommendation is contrary to the views of the Parish and Town Council.

Proposal:

1. Planning permission is sought for reserved matters (access, layout, scale, appearance, landscaping and parking) for 180 dwellings following the approval of DC/13/0932/HYB. The application also includes details reserved by conditions C19 (Design Statement), C20 (Parking), C21 (Roads), C22 (Highway Drainage), C23 (Estate Roads), C30 (Soft Landscaping), C31 (Levels), C35 (Foul Water), C36 (SuDS) and C37 (Refuse).
2. The application has been amended since submission to amend the layout, parking provision, house types and hard and soft landscaping.

Application Supporting Material:

3. Information submitted with the application as follows:
 - Location Plan
 - Amended Design Statement
 - Amended Site Layout
 - Amended Refuse Strategy
 - Amended Materials Plan
 - Amended Levels Plan
 - Amended Adoption Plan
 - Amended Visibility Plan
 - Amended Drainage Strategy
 - Amended Street Lighting details
 - Amended Landscaping Plans and details
 - Plans and Elevations
 - Noise Impact Assessment
 - Planning Statement
 - Street Elevations
 - Statement of Community Involvement

Site Details:

4. The site is situated to the north west of Bury St Edmunds and is comprised of 3 parcels of land with a total area of 5.16ha. The parcels are known as Development Zones I, K and L and are allocated for residential development following the approval of application DC/13/0932/HYB. This permission granted full permission for a new link road from Mildenhall Road (A1101) to Tut Hill (B1106), the change of use of agricultural land to informal countryside recreation and outline permission for, inter alia, residential development. This site is now being marketed as 'Marham Park' and construction has commenced on the

strategic infrastructure including roads, footpaths, cycleways, drainage and landscaping. The residential development at Marham Park has been divided into a series of Development Zones accessed via a road called the Primary Movement Corridor. This road has been granted reserved matters approval establishing the points of access into the Development Zones, the landscaping of the road and the location of footpaths and cycleways.

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 conditions or seek approval of reserved matters have been submitted, the following being particularly relevant to the consideration of this application:
 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/16/0446/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 126 dwellings on Development Zone C. Approved

14.DC/16/2837/RM. Reserved Matters Application for 151 dwellings on Development Zones G and H. Approved.

Consultations:

15.Environment Team: No comments

Comments on amended plans: No comments

16.Anglian Water: No comments

Comments on amended plans: No comments received

17.Environment Agency: No comments

Comments on amended plans: No comments received

18.Suffolk County Council (SCC) Flood and Water Engineer: The clarification and amended information provided by the applicant answers my queries satisfactorily and the surface water drainage scheme is acceptable.

Comments on amended plans: Following consultation with MLM Consulting, SCC Flood & Water Management wish to revise our position since our last comments (dated 16 May 2017). SCC Flood & Water Management recommend that approval is not given to Parcel K as the drainage strategy for that parcel does not comply the site wide SuDS strategy.

Currently there is exceedance flooding in Parcel K of roughly 250m³ during the 100yr+CC storm event. The strategic SuDS have been designed to accept 100yr+CC flows from each parcel and therefore exceedance should not be an issue with any parcel, thus any unattenuated runoff within a parcel must be accounted for. SCC require that the drainage design for Parcel K is amended so there is no uncontrolled discharge from the parcel whilst keeping to maximum outflow rates (in this case 412l/s for parcel K). We have no further comments for Parcels I and L.

19.Highways England: No objection

Comments on amended plans: The changes to the proposed development are unlikely to have any bearing on its impact on the strategic road network. Our previous recommendation may therefore remain in place.

20.Public Health and Housing: No objection

Comments on amended plans: No objection however in order to protect

the residents from potential loss of amenity due to road traffic noise to some of the units it is recommended that they are constructed in accordance with the noise report Ref: 162400-01A attached to the application.

21. Highway Authority: Amendments are required to the layout, parking, cycle provision, trees and interconnectivity.

Comments on amended plans: Overall the conditions C20, C21, C22 and C23 are acceptable however specific details of construction should be to Suffolk Estates Roads Specifications and Suffolk Design Guide and will be determined through the Section 38 process. The surface water strategy is acceptable and further details of design can be agreed through the Section 38 process. Trees within 5m of the highway will need a suitable root protection barrier which can be agreed through the Section 38 process if different barriers are required.

22. Strategy and Enabling Officer: Support the application in principle as it meets policy CS5 to deliver 30% affordable housing on site and also meets the requirements of the s106 to achieve 70% affordable rent and 30% intermediate housing. The affordable housing has also been clustered in accordance with the s106 to help achieve a sustainable and cohesive community. However I have concern over the car parking provision on site in particular the lack of provision of the two bedroom dwellings as they will be occupied to maximum occupation and the lack of visitor parking. I am mindful that only 10% of the market dwellings are 'smaller' dwellings which will make it difficult for first time buyers to access the property market.

Comments on amended plans: No comments received

23. Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service: Archaeological works are subject to conditions on the outline consent so therefore no comment on this reserved matters application.

Comments on amended plans: No comments received

24. Police Architectural Liaison Officer: Concerned regarding rear parking to dwellings and garages sited to the rear. The layout allows for dark long rear access alleyways to gardens. It is recommended that the applicant apply for secured by design and incorporate security measures.

Comments on amended plans: No comments received

25. Ecology, Tree and Landscape Officer: The proposed layout takes a minimalist approach to providing additional open space, landscape features and amenity areas. Of particular concern is:

- the lack of an effective green barrier for amenity and security and to control permeability between the land parcels and the proposed link road;
- the lack of space to provide the formal avenue of trees on the main

Street;

- the lack of access to an amenity open space such as a neighbourhood green for properties in the central part of development K;
- the location of fragmented areas above drainage easements that create unusable space that is likely to attract anti-social behaviour.
- the simplistic approach to strategic landscaping which on the whole is restricted to the laying of amenity grass – this is limited in both its landscape and biodiversity contribution.

There is insufficient information regarding the SUDS feature. Bin collection points should not be within public open space. Amenity grass should be removed from all areas and replaced with floral lawn. It is not clear what areas are public and private. Considerations should be given to diversifying the planting. Limited space is provided to the edge of the site for new planting. Open spaces should be designed to be positive and secure. There is insufficient biodiversity enhancements.

Comments on amended plans: No comments received

26. Natural England: No objection

Representations:

27. Fornham All Saints Parish Council: Objects for the following reason:

- Density of development does not complement the area and is more in keeping with a main town rather than edge of town abutting a rural village.
- Development will not complement or preserve the area.
- Provision of parking is insufficient in terms of number and location of spaces and will lead to amenity issues and impact on highway network.
- Parking arrangements do not produce safe and securing parking and would result in on road parking.
- Emergency vehicles will not be able to access the site.
- Parking not located adjacent to dwellings encouraging criminal activity.
- Questions the street hierarchy and the establishment of restricted vehicular access routes at the end of secondary routes which will not be safe and accessible.
- Footway should be 2m wide as per Manual for Streets.
- Concerned at a lack of gardens.
- Concerned at lack of soft landscaping.
- Floorspace is below minimum standards with particular concerns over 2-3 bedroom dwellings.

Parish Council comments on amended plans:

- The majority of the changes are relatively small and mainly cosmetic therefore the earlier objections remain.
- Parking layout proposes parking in front of neighbouring properties and will cause confusion between neighbours.

- The houses are small and the gardens are smaller.
- Car parking is inadequate with not enough spaces and tandem parking will result in on-road parking.
- Parking spaces are not large enough which will cause neighbour disputes
- On street parking would restrict emergency access.
- No disabled spaces provided.
- Estate will not be a pleasant place to live.

28. Bury St Edmunds Town Council: Object on grounds of density of buildings.

Bury St Edmunds Town Council comments on amended plans: Object on same grounds as previously.

29. Ward Member: No comments received

Policy: The following policies of the Joint Development Management Policies Document, Bury St Edmunds Vision 2013 and the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy December 2010 have been taken into account in the consideration of this application:

30. Bury St Edmunds Vision 2013 (September 2014):

- Policy BV1 – Presumption in favour of sustainable development
- Policy BV2 – Housing Development
- Policy BV3 – North West Bury

31. 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

32. St Edmundsbury Core Strategy December 2010

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

Other Planning Policy:

33. National Planning Policy Framework (2012) core principles and paragraphs 56 – 68

Officer Comment:

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

- Principle of Development
- Access, parking, layout, appearance, scale and landscaping
- Whether the submitted information is sufficient to discharge the conditions applied for.

Principle of Development

35. The application seeks approval of reserved matters and associated conditions following the approval of planning permission reference DC/13/0932/HYB which established the principle of residential development within Development Zones I, K and L at Marham Park.
36. Approved as part of DC/13/0932/HYB (and also contained within the adopted masterplan for this site) was a density parameter plan which specifies density ranges for each Development Zone. Taking account of the size of each Development Zone, the approved density ranges establish that Development Zone I can in principle accommodate up to 53 dwellings, Development Zone K can accommodate up to 91 dwellings and Development Zone L can accommodate up to 36 dwellings. This results in a maximum of 180 dwellings across all three Development Zones. The application seeks permission for 180 dwellings and accordingly, whilst the Parish and Town Council object to the density of development, it is considered that the number of dwellings proposed is acceptable in principle.

Character, context and design

37. The vision of the adopted Masterplan for this site is to deliver a new community with a strong sense of local identity. The masterplan contained a Framework Plan which outlines the townscape principles to be adopted at the detailed design stage and defines key character areas to shape the form of development. The Framework Plan divides the residential Development Zones into four character areas: Community Heart; Formal Character; Semi-formal Character and Informal Green Character. However the only character areas relevant to Development Zones I, K and L are Community Heart and Formal Character.
38. The masterplan defines Community Heart as being characterised by a consistent building line, having higher levels of continuous frontage and narrower threshold space with a tight urban grain with influences drawn from Bury St Edmunds town centre and surrounding streets. The Formal Character area is to be characterised by a consistent building rhythm, consistent building spacing and consistent building line.
39. Development Zone I is proposed to be a combination of Community Heart and Formal Character in accordance with the Framework Plan. This Development Zone has the highest density (37.5 dwellings per hectare) in accordance with the approved density parameter plan. The application proposes three storey apartment buildings and 3 storey dwellings fronting onto the public square and primary movement corridor. The form of these buildings have been amended to reflect more closely the local vernacular following negotiations during the course of the application. These buildings would be located close to the pavement providing a tight urban grain and sense of enclosure in this area and it is considered that as amended the application proposes a Community Heart in accordance with the principles of the masterplan.
40. As the site moves northeast, the Framework Plan requires Development

Zones I, K and L to be of Formal Character. In response to this the applicants have submitted proposals which define 3 character areas (Key Formal Frontage, Formal Main Street Frontage, and Carriageway Corridor Frontage) which demonstrate consistent building lines, consistent building spacing and consistent building rhythm. A different palette of materials and detailing is provided to distinguish between the 3 character areas so for example the Formal Main Street incorporates the use of slate grey tiles, buff brick and off white render whilst the Carriageway Corridor Frontage incorporates dark red tiles, red and multi stock brick and pastel render.

41. Whilst the character areas identified above are proposed to the Development Zone frontages, a fifth character area described in the application as Mews Frontage is proposed on roads running perpendicular to the main Development Zone frontages. This character area is defined by higher density terraces with a tight urban grain with simple rhythm and palette of materials to reflect terraced streets on approach to Bury town centre.
42. The application proposes a total of 18 different house types and whilst these are standard house types reflective of the applicant being a major housebuilder, Officers consider that they contain sufficient detail to reflect local characteristics. Amendments have been sought to the form of the apartment buildings and additional detailing has been provided in the form of bargeboards on prominent gables and the incorporation of toothed brick quoins on rendered dwellings. It is considered that these amendments improve the appearance of the dwellings.
43. The Police Architectural Liaison Officer has raised some concerns regarding the use of parking courts to the rear of buildings, however officers consider that with apartment windows overlooking these parking courts they would be sufficiently visible to ensure that they are safe and would not encourage crime. Amended plans have been provided to clarify the treatments of boundaries and officers consider that this would control permeability through the site helping to ensure a safe environment. Furthermore, plans have been amended to reduce the number of instances where access to rear gardens is via enclosed alleyways. Where these are proposed access gates will be provided which can be secured by homeowners. The Police Architectural Liaison Officer also raised concern regarding the incorporation of garages to the rear of dwellings however these would be located in homeowners rear gardens and officers consider they would be well observed. It is therefore considered by Officers that crime and anti-social behaviour have been adequately addressed.
44. Overall it is considered that the proposed arrangement of buildings sufficiently reflects the masterplan and the requirements of development plan policies to conclude that the development is acceptable in terms of character, context and design. Condition C19 imposed on planning permission DC/13/0932/HYB requires a Design Statement to be submitted concurrently with the submission of reserved matters. It is considered that the Design and Access statement is sufficient to enable this condition to be discharged in respect of Development Zone I, K and L.

Access, Road Network and Parking

45. The Development Zones would be served by vehicular access points approved as part of the reserved matters approvals for the Primary Movement Corridor. These provide one point of access into Development Zone I, two points of access into Development Zone K and one point of access into Development Zone L. Also proposed are points of connection for pedestrians and cyclists onto the surrounding network of footpaths, cycleways and landscape parcels which would encourage movement through the site and encourage sustainable transport options. The Highways Authority raises no objection to the access arrangements and officers are satisfied that these arrangements would not result in conditions detrimental to highway safety or the satisfactory functioning of the local highway network. Plans have been provided to demonstrate that appropriate visibility splays would be achievable throughout the development.
46. Each Development Zone would take access from the Primary Movement Corridor via a 5.5m wide minor access road with 1.8m wide footway to one or both sides. These would transition into shared surface roads also 5.5m in width (with 1m wide service strips either side) or 4.5m wide private drives. The Parish Council have requested 2m wide footpaths however the Highway Authority are satisfied that 1.8m wide footpaths are acceptable being in accordance with the Suffolk Design Guide. As originally submitted the application proposed a continuous road along the north boundary of development Zone K linking both points of access onto the Primary Movement Corridor. The application has subsequently been amended following concerns raised by the Highway Authority and officers that such a long stretch of straight road would encourage high vehicle speeds. The amendments have removed the continuous stretch of road through the introduction of a private drive and landscaped area preventing vehicles from entering via one point of access and leaving via the other. It is considered that this provides suitable traffic calming to ensure that traffic speeds will not be excessive and results in a design suitable for the residential location. The road network has also been amended in Development Zone L to reduce the length of road adjacent to the Primary Movement Corridor.
47. The application proposes a variety of allocated on and off plot parking for residents in addition to unallocated parking for visitors. The number of spaces proposed is in accordance with the Suffolk Guidance for Parking 2015 and the Highway Authority raise no objection to the number or layout of parking spaces proposed. It is noted that the Parish Council object to the level of parking as they consider that the scheme would generate parking requirements above the number of spaces provided resulting in on-road parking which they consider would be detrimental to highway safety and the functioning of the road network and would prevent emergency and service vehicles from accessing dwellings. However, given that the number of spaces is in accordance with the requirements of the Parking Guidelines, the Highway Authority do not object. Furthermore, the width and alignment of roads would enable emergency vehicles to

pass even in the event of roadside parking it is not considered that the parking provision represents grounds for refusal.

48. The Highway Authority have confirmed that the level of information submitted is sufficient to satisfy the requirement of conditions C20 (Parking), C21 (Roads), C22 (Drainage) and C23 (Estate Roads). The applicant will need to enter into a Section 38 Agreement with the Highway Authority for the adoption of the roads where further information may be required by the Highway Authority but this not necessary to be provided at the planning stage. It is also the opinion of officers that the submitted refuse collection plan is sufficient in respect of condition C37 for Development Zones I, K and L. Each dwelling will be served by bin storage points either to the rear of dwellings or within purpose built facilities and collection points can be adequately accessed by refuse vehicles.

Scale and Housing Mix

49. As already established, the approved density parameter plan establishes that the principle of 180 dwellings across these 3 development zones is acceptable. Therefore whilst the Parish and Town Councils object due to the number of dwellings proposed it is considered that the principle of the development is acceptable. Furthermore, by delivering the maximum number of dwellings allowed by the density parameter plans the development is making efficient use of land and helping to meet the Borough Councils housing need in a strategic and sustainable location.

50. The application proposes a mix of 2, 2.5 and 3 storey dwellings. The masterplan for the site includes a building heights plan which establishes that within the Community Heart the buildings can be 4 storey and up to 18m high and elsewhere across these development zones the buildings can be a maximum of 3 storeys and 15m high. The commentary to the building height plan establishes that for the most part building heights will be 2 and 2.5 storeys with buildings only exceeding these in key locations to perform important townscape functions. Officers consider that the application complies with these requirements being dominated by 2 and 2.5 storey dwellings but with 3 storey dwellings and apartments incorporated to provide focal points and assist in way finding.

51. In terms of the housing mix, the application proposes the following overall mix. The figures in column 4 are the requirements of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 (SHMA):

House Type	Number proposed	Percentage of development	SHMA requirement	Difference
1 bedroom	18	10%	4% (including bedsits)	+6%
2 bedroom	37	21%	26%	-5%
3 bedroom	69	38%	45%	-7%
4 bedroom	41	23%	25% (including 5 beds)	+6% (including 5 beds)
5 bedroom	15	8%		
	180	100%	100%	

52. The above table identifies that the proposed housing mix provides a slight overprovision of 1 and 4/5 bedroom dwellings (6%) and a modest under provision of 2 and 3 bedroom dwellings (5% and 7%) however officers consider that overall the mix is in close correlation with the SHMA and accordingly the housing mix overall is acceptable.
53. Furthermore, the proposal would deliver 30% affordable housing of which 70% would be affordable rent and 30% would be intermediate housing in accordance with the section 106 agreement signed for application DC/13/0932/HYB. The application therefore receives the support in principle from the Strategy and Enabling Officer. Furthermore, there are no objections to the clustering of affordable houses which is also in accordance with the s106 agreement. The Strategy and Enabling Officer has raised concern that the level of parking for the affordable units will not be sufficient as the dwellings are likely to be occupied to maximum occupation however as addressed earlier in this report, the level of parking is in accordance with Suffolk Parking Guidelines and the Highway Authority raise no objection. Furthermore, the level of parking provided for the affordable dwellings is the same as that for the affordable dwellings with 1 space for 1 bedroom dwellings; 2 spaces for 2 and 3 bedroom dwellings and 3 spaces for 4 and 5 bedroom dwellings.
54. The Strategy and Enabling Officer is also mindful that market dwellings are weighted more heavily towards larger 3 and 4 bedroom dwellings with only 10% of the market dwellings being 1 and 2 bedroom properties. However, the overall housing mix is dictated by the affordable housing requirements and the SHMA. The Strategy and Enabling Officer raises no objection to the affordable housing mix being proposed and the overall mix is in accordance with the SHMA therefore officers consider that the housing mix is acceptable.
55. The Parish Council have raised concern regarding the size of dwellings however this is not a matter which either Public Health and Housing or the Strategy and Enabling Officer have objected to. The following table provides a range of dwelling sizes being proposed and compares then to the Nationally Described Spaces Standards (NDSS). Members are however advised that these standards have not been adopted by this authority and cannot be used in the decision making process. They are however provided as a point of reference and to give some context to what is being proposed.

Dwelling type	Proposed range	NDSS
1 bed (flat)	41.8sq m	39-50sq m
2 bed (flat)	50.3-62.2sq m	61 - 70sq m
2 bed house	65.4-69.7sq m	70 - 79sq m
3 bed house	86 – 123sq m	84 - 102sq m
4 bed house	102.6 – 164sq m	97 – 130sq m
5 bed house	207.7sq m	110 – 134sq m

56. This table demonstrates that the 1 and 2 bedroom dwellings are generally below the Nationally Described Space Standards whilst the 3, 4 and 5 bedroom dwellings generally exceed these standards. However, officers re-iterate that these are not standards adopted by this Authority and a decision cannot be based upon compliance with these standards. Reference to space should instead be made to DM22 which requires dwellings to be fit for purpose and function well, providing adequate space, light and privacy for occupants. The submitted plans show how rooms could be laid out with furniture and it is considered that they proposed dwellings meet this policy requirement of being 'fit for purpose'. Furthermore, the dwellings would be served by private gardens or have good access to public open space being near to the strategic green infrastructure provided to the north of the link road.

57. Overall it is considered that the proposed scale and housing mix proposed is acceptable in accordance with the masterplan and development plan policies.

Landscaping

58. The application was subject to detailed comments from the Ecology, Tree and Landscape Officer who raised particular concern regarding the lack of an effective green barrier between the Development Zones and footpath to the new Link Road; the lack of space to provide a formal avenue of trees on the primary movement corridor; the lack of amenity space within Development Zone K; the location of fragmented areas of open space; and the simplistic approach to strategic landscaping.

59. As a consequence amended plans and details have been submitted to address these issues. The amended plans provide a native species hedge to the boundary between Development Zone I & K and the adjacent footpath and elsewhere along this boundary estate railing has been introduced to reinforce the boundary. It is considered that these measures would aid security and control permeability between the application site and the footpath as well as contributing to the character and appearance of the area. A significant increase in tree planting has also been provided to this boundary providing an avenue of trees to the link road boundary. Plans have also been amended to provide more space between roads within the Development Zone and the primary movement corridor to facilitate in the delivery of the trees proposed along this boundary. This would assist in the delivery of a tree lined avenue along the primary movement corridor in accordance with the masterplan.

60. No amendments have been made to provide open amenity space within Development Zone K as requested by the Landscape and Ecology Officer. On this matter the applicant has referred to the Framework Plan and Landscape and Ecology Strategy within the adopted Masterplan which, unlike other Development Zones, do not identify the provision of any Local Greens within Development Zones I, K and L. These parcels are considered to be significantly constrained by their narrow width and small size relative to other Development Zones and are well located relative to

the strategic green infrastructure and accordingly it is not considered that there is a requirement to provide amenity space within these Development Zones as a matter of principle. Such space would aid in place making and its exclusion does result in Development Zones which are dominated by dwellings and residential infrastructure but officers consider that on balance, bearing in mind the significant landscaping delivered outside of the Development Zones, the lack of on site amenity space is not a reason for refusal.

61. Where open space is provided within these Development Zones it is often incidental pieces of space adjacent to the site boundaries. Whilst these are not likely to be meaningful in terms of providing useable space, such spaces would help soften the development and amendments have been submitted to clarify how such spaces would be used and whether they can be considered public or private spaces. For example, the land adjacent to plots 136-147 is now shown to be enclosed by hedgerows and/or estate railing creating private amenity space for the residents and controlling access to this land.
62. Other amendments to the landscaping scheme seek to increase the number of trees with particular focus on the boundaries between the development zone and the Link Road. The Highway Authority have raised concern regarding the placement of some trees relative to the highway but advise that a different route guard system could be agreed through the section 38 process where necessary.
63. No comments have been received from the Landscape and Ecology Officer following the submission of amended plans but officers consider that the proposal, as amended, is acceptable in landscape terms. Any further comments if received will be reported in late papers or verbally.
64. The Landscape and Ecology Officer also raised concern that the level of ecological enhancements was insufficient. The plans have been amended to include a total of 12 bat and bird boxes to be fixed to dwellings. Officers have requested that this figure is increased substantially given the limited opportunity for other enhancements on these Development Zones due to the limited on site open space. Members will be updated in late papers or verbally on the applicant's response to this. Subject to satisfactory amendments being received to the ecological enhancement it is considered that sufficient information has been submitted to discharge condition C30.

Drainage

65. The application is supported by a Drainage Statement for foul and surface water. The foul water strategy would convey all foul water via a gravity system to the strategic foul water network. Anglian Water have raised no objections to the proposed foul water strategy.
66. In respect of the surface water drainage scheme, the Suffolk County Council Flood and Water Engineer has commented that the proposed surface water drainage scheme for development Zone K does not comply

with the site wide SuDS strategy. It is necessary therefore for the drainage design to be amended and this is a matter which has been raised with the applicant. At the time of writing this issue has not been resolved but it is not considered to be a matter which cannot be resolved through a revision to the drainage strategy. Members will be updated in late papers or verbally of any progress on this issue. In the event that the issue is not resolved ahead of Development Control Committee it is recommended that condition C36 is not approved and is removed from the description of development.

Conclusion:

67. 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.

68. No further conditions are required given that this is a reserved matters application and given the requirements of the conditions imposed on the outline consent.

Recommendation:

69. It is recommended that planning permission be **APPROVED** subject to the following condition:

1. Plans and Documents condition

Documents:

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