

Development Control Committee

13 May 2020

Planning Application DC/19/1952/FUL - Land at The Grove, Beck Row

Date Registered: 08.10.2019 **Expiry Date:** 01.05.2020

Case Officer: Adam Ford **Recommendation:** Approve Application

Parish: Beck Row, Holywell Row & Kenny Hill **Ward:** The Rows

Proposal: Planning Application - 2no. dwellings with associated access and parking area (following demolition of existing bungalow)

Site: Land At, The Grove, Beck Row

Applicant: Mr John Simmons

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:

Adam Ford
Email: adam.ford@westsuffolk.gov.uk
Telephone: 01284 757353

Background:

This application is referred to the Development Control Committee because, despite there being no conflict between the Officer recommendation and the Parish Council's view, the proposal which is recommended for approval technically represents a departure from the Development Plan.

Proposal:

1. The application seeks planning permission for two dwellings following the demolition of an existing bungalow which occupies the site. It therefore represents a 'replacement' and a further new dwelling.
2. Both dwellings as proposed are two storey units with 4 bedrooms on their first floor. The dwellings have an eaves height of 4m and a ridge height of 6.9m. Each dwelling has a footprint of 9.5m x 10m. They are the same house type and will occupy the site as a pair of detached dwellings.
3. Externally, each dwelling will be finished with facing brick work and tiles although the precise details have not been confirmed and can be controlled through a suitably worded planning condition.

Application Supporting Material:

4. The information submitted with the application includes:
 - Site location plan
 - Proposed block plan
 - Proposed floor plans and elevations
 - Planning statement
 - Noise impact assessment
 - Contamination assessment

Site Details:

5. The 0.1 hectare application site in question lies 45 metres outside of the defined settlement for Beck Row. Presently the site is occupied by a single storey bungalow which will be demolished should planning permission be granted.
6. The area is typified by residential development with similarly styled dwellings to the South West of the application site and further residential development to the North and North East of the site. RAF Mildenhall lies to the South of the site.
7. It should also be noted that the application site forms part of a larger site which already has planning permission for up to 8 dwellings under DC/16/0436/HYB. However, although 8 dwellings were approved, the applicant opted to only build 7 as confirmed through the approval of DC/17/1189/RM.

Planning History:

8.

DC/16/0436/HYB	Hybrid planning application (i) Full planning application for the demolition of 1no. bungalow and (ii) Outline planning application (Means of Access to be considered) for 8no. dwellings	Application Granted	01.08.2016
DC/17/1189/RM	Reserved Matters Application - Submission of details under planning permission DC/16/0436/HYB - the means of access, appearance, layout and scale for 8 dwellings (following demolition of existing dwelling)	Application Granted	22.09.2017
DCON(1)/16/0436	Application to discharge B9 (footway and pedestrian crossing), B10 (access), C19 (contamination) of DC/16/0436/HYB	Application Granted	13.10.2017
DCON(2)/16/0436	Application to Discharge Condition C17 (Archaeology) of DC/16/0436/HYB	Application Granted	26.09.2017

Consultations:

9.

SCC Highway Authority

- No objection subject to conditions

Public Health & Housing

- No objection subject to conditions

LPA Environment Team

- No objection subject to conditions

Strategic Housing Team

- 30% affordable housing contribution required for 1 x dwelling

Ministry of Defence

- No objection to proposal subject to conditions

Suffolk Wildlife Trust

- No response provided

Representations:

10.

Parish Council

- The Parish Council confirmed their support for the scheme in a formal response dated 14th November 2019

Ward Member

- No comments provided

Public representations

11.

White Gables, Stock Corner, Beck Row

- Support for the application provided

Lilac Bungalow, The Grove, Beck Row

- Objection to the proposal due to perceived noncompliance with details agreed under DC/17/1189/RM and lack of relevant information

Planning Policy:

12. On 1 April 2019 Forest Heath District Council and St Edmundsbury Borough Council were replaced by a single Authority, West Suffolk Council. The development plans for the previous local planning authorities were carried forward to the new Council by Regulation.

13. The Development Plans remain in place for the new West Suffolk Council and, with the exception of the Joint Development Management Policies document (which had been adopted by both Councils), set out policies for defined geographical areas within the new authority. It is therefore necessary to determine this application with reference to policies set out in the plans produced by the now dissolved Forest Heath District Council.

14. The following policies of the Joint Development Management Policies Document and the Forest Heath Core Strategy 2010 have been taken into account in the consideration of this application:

Site Allocations Local Plan 2019

- Site Allocations Local Plan 2019 (former Forest Heath area) SA1 - Settlement boundaries

Core Strategy Document 2010

- Core Strategy Policy CS1 - Spatial Strategy
- Core Strategy Policy CS2 - Natural Environment
- Core Strategy Policy CS5 - Design quality and local distinctiveness
- Core Strategy Policy CS9 - Affordable Housing Provision
- Core Strategy Policy C10 – Rural Communities

Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015

- Policy DM1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- Policy DM2 Creating Places Development Principles and Local Distinctiveness
- Policy DM5 Development in the Countryside
- Policy DM11 Protected Species
- Policy DM14 Protecting and Enhancing Natural Resources, Minimising Pollution and Safeguarding from Hazards
- Policy DM22 Residential Design
- Policy DM27 Housing in the Countryside
- Policy DM46 Parking Standards

Other Planning Policy:

15.National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

The NPPF was revised in February 2019 and is a material consideration in decision making from the day of its publication. Paragraph 213 is clear however, that existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of the revised NPPF. Due weight should be given to them according to their degree of consistency with the Framework; the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework; the greater weight that may be given. The policies set out within the Joint Development Management Policies have been assessed in detail and are considered sufficiently aligned with the provision of the 2019 NPPF that full weight can be attached to them in the decision-making process.

Officer Comment:

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

- Principle of Development
- Affordable housing
- Design, scale and form
- Impact on amenity
- Noise from nearby military activity
- Ecological impacts
- Highway implications

Legal context

17.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 Forest Heath Development Plan comprises the policies set out in the Joint Development Management Policies Document (adopted February 2015), and the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (adopted May 2010).

18.National planning policies set out in the revised National Planning Policy Framework 2019 are also a key material consideration.

The principle of Development

19.As noted earlier in this report, the application site in question is located outside any defined settlement boundary and as such, the proposal technically comprises development in the countryside from a land use perspective.

20.From a national planning policy perspective, the NPPF (2019) is clear at paragraph 79 that LPAs should avoid granting planning permission for residential development in the countryside unless material factors indicate otherwise. This position is further reflected in local planning policies (SA1, CS1, CS10, DM5 and DM27) which state that planning permission for residential development in the countryside will typically **not** be supported unless there are valid and material reasons for doing so.

21.Ultimately, proposals for residential development outside of defined settlements must be considered carefully as it is incumbent upon the LPA to ensure areas which are designated as countryside are protected from unsustainable and inappropriate development. Accordingly, where material planning considerations indicate that proposals in the countryside are unacceptable, due to conflict with the development plan they should be resisted.

22.In line with policy SA1 of the 2019 Site Allocations Local Plan, Policy CS1 of the former FHDC Core Strategy confirms and clarifies that proposals for residential development should be directed towards the sustainable settlements and, where possible, away from the open countryside. This is further bolstered by policy CS10 which dictates that in villages and small settlements not identified for a specific level of growth in the Spatial Strategy, including the open countryside, residential development will only be permitted where:

- A. There are no suitable sites available inside the limits of a defined settlement boundary;
- B. It is an affordable housing scheme for local needs in accordance with Policy CS9;
- C. It involves the appropriate re-use of a rural building;
- D. It provides a site for gypsy and travellers or travelling show people which complies with the Gypsies and Travellers policy in Policy CS8.
- E. It is a replacement of an existing dwelling;
- F. It is a dwelling required in association with existing rural enterprises which complies with the requirements of national guidance in relation to new dwelling houses in the countryside.

23.In this instance, the proposal is for two dwellings beyond the settlement boundary following the demolition of an existing bungalow. As such, the

broad principle of a 'like for like' replacement is deemed acceptable given the remit of policy DM5.

24.However, the proposed dwellings are both larger in scale and footprint than the existing bungalow and as such, it cannot be argued that either of the dwellings represents a policy compliant (DM5) replacement for the bungalow which is currently in situ. In addition, the dwellings as proposed do not meet any of the exceptions for dwellings in the countryside as set out by policies DM5, DM27 or CS10. It is for this reason that the proposal represents a conflict with the development plan both with respect to the 'replacement' and the new dwelling.

25.However, whilst the primacy of the development is acknowledged, if material planning considerations indicate otherwise, in accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 the LPA may grant planning permission for development which does not strictly accord with the development plan.

26.This is relevant to the proposal under determination due to its urban context, prevailing built form and the locality's character. The site's planning history is also pertinent to this point as the site benefits from a recent grant of up to 8 dwellings.

27.It is noted that national and local policy aim to prevent unsustainable development from taking place and that policies such as DM5 and CS10 aim to retain the intrinsic beauty of the countryside. However, whilst the application site technically sits outside of the settlement boundary, it is not open, undeveloped countryside as DM5 intends and it does not represent a site which the LPA would strive to prohibit from being developed on the basis of countryside integrity alone. It already contains a lawful bungalow and planning permission has been granted for its re-development through recently approved planning applications.

28.As illustrated by the submitted plans, the site lies in between two existing pockets of residential development and is presently occupied by a single storey bungalow. Given the lack of harm arising, the area's existing built form and the way in which the site would positively relate the existing off site dwellings by creating a coherent street scene (discussed further below), despite the technical conflict with the development plan, the principle of development on this site for two further houses is something that can be supported.

Affordable housing

29.This application is for two dwellings only and it does not represent the usual scale or size of development whereby the LPA would typically seek affordable housing requirements pursuant to the NPPF or policy CS9 of the Core Strategy.

30.The below commentary is provided to illustrate why, in this instance, an affordable housing contribution is required for a two dwelling scheme.

31.Planning application DC/16/0436/HYB approved up to 8 dwellings (albeit in a larger red line) and, due to ministerial advice in place at the time,

restricted them to limit the internal floor space to not exceed 1,000sqm. However, the reserved matters application (DC/17/1189/RM) then approved 7 dwellings and retained the existing bungalow; the floor space did not exceed 1,000sqm in compliance with the outline permission, but this limit only applied to new floor space; not the existing bungalow.

32. It was accepted that this site would not trigger affordable housing if the new floor space (associated with DC/16/0436/HYB and DC/17/1189/RM) within the red line did not exceed 1,000sqm. This was based upon the fact that only 8 dwellings in total could exist within the site's red line, that one of 8 was now to be recognised as an existing dwelling and all new dwellings would be limited to 1,000sqm of new floor space in any event.
33. A new permission that now seeks to replace the existing bungalow with two dwellings, would represent an additional dwelling; a net gain of one unit, within the original site. Although this new application has its own smaller red line, it would be incorrect for the LPA to not consider the implications of this additional dwelling on the site. In terms of the original red line, subdividing an extant site in this way, and not having such a consideration, would present an opportunity for developers to circumnavigate affordable housing policies. This would be contrary to the NPPF's intended application.
34. The NPPF is clear that sites under 10 dwellings do not, in isolation, trigger affordable housing. However, hypothetically, if a developer submitted an application for 9, gained approval without triggering affordable housing and then submitted another application with a smaller red line, that sat within the original red line, thus increasing the number of dwellings overall, then the LPA has an obligation to protect the integrity of the intention of the NPPF policy and consider the new total number of dwellings now proposed, in combination on the site as a whole.
35. To not take this approach would be contrary to the NPPF's purpose, since all sites that had the ability to intensify in this way, could be approached in two or more separate applications and upon gaining the first permission, could in turn, circumnavigate the NPPF 10 dwelling trigger, by eventually increasing the overall dwellings on a given site, in subdividing the red line multiple times. Thus, with reference to this application, the LPA is entitled to consider the impact in combination with the first 8 dwellings and now these two dwellings as proposed.
36. For the avoidance of doubt, on this site, there were up to 8 dwellings approved by the hybrid application and then the reserved matters application approved 7 new dwellings and excluded them from triggering affordable housing by limiting their internal floor space, in addition to an existing dwelling.
37. This current subsequent application to replace the existing dwelling, represents a replacement dwelling and one additional dwelling. If approved then, in combination with the original permission, there would be (7+1) 8 additional dwellings within the same area of the original permission. Taking the NPPF into account, the combination by site area (0.75ha) would trigger affordable housing.
38. The normal consideration would then be to seek the Council's policy of 30% affordable housing (CS9) against all 8 additional dwellings, however,

acknowledging the first 7 are restricted by floor space and cannot be considered twice, the LPA intends to apply the 30% to 1 additional dwelling, resulting in an equivalent 0.3 contribution which would be secured through a S106 agreement.

39. This approach has been set out in writing to the applicant who has agreed to enter into a legal agreement for a 0.3 contribution; which, in reality, works out to 30% of 1 dwelling as a financial contribution.

Design, scale and form

40. With the principle of development established as being something that the can be supported, albeit representative of a conflict with the development plan, consideration must next be given to the design, form and scale of the proposed development.

41. In conjunction with policy DM2, policy DM22 indicates that residential development proposals should maintain or create a sense of place and/or character by utilising the characteristics of the locality to create buildings and spaces that have a strong sense of place and distinctiveness, using an appropriate innovative design approach and incorporating a mix of housing and unit sizes that is appropriate for the location.

42. In this instance, the existing bungalow is flanked by larger developments which are similar in design, scale and appearance. The sense of place is broken by the existing disparity in dwelling type and the inclusion of two proposed dwellings represent a visual enhancement to the locality which gives rise to a stronger, more prominent sense of place.

43. The proposed dwellings are commensurate in scale and form with the prevailing development and they do not present as a jarring or visually incongruent addition to the area's character. The ridge height of both dwellings has been designed so that it does not exceed the developments which flank the application site and following negotiation with the applicant the eaves of the proposed dwellings have been amended so that they relate to the existing dwellings which would be read in conjunction with the proposal. As a result, the dwellings complement and harmonise with the existing built form. This positive contribution to the existing but fragmented vernacular represents a material factor in favour of the proposal despite the technical conflict with the plan.

44. The prevailing vernacular is strengthened and enhanced as a result of the development's sympathetic and responsive design which allows it to present as a continuation of the existing development without appearing as a dull precise copycat style development. Accordingly, the design form and scale of the proposal is judged to be at a level which satisfies policies DM2, DM22 and CS5 such that it represents a significant benefit to the locality's character and visual profile. A stronger, more coherent sense of place is created, as required by DM2 and DM22 and this weighs considerably in favour of the proposal.

Impact on amenity

45. Both policies DM2 and DM22 seek to secure development proposals which do not have an unduly adverse impact on residential amenity. This

requirement is particularly relevant to the proposal under consideration as the application site is adjacent to existing dwellings and existing private amenity space.

46. With respect to the overall scale and massing, the proposed dwellings do not appear as inappropriately large and they are not positioned in such a way that they are looming over existing boundary treatments. The application site is separated from off site dwellings by existing vehicular access roads and as such, the proposal is not judged to represent an overbearing development.
47. A similar position with respect to overlooking also arises; because the two dwellings are located on their own pocket of land, with a road on either side, therefore unacceptable and undue overlooking does not arise. Views from the first floor dormer windows to the North of the dwelling look onto undeveloped paddock whilst the upper floor windows of the proposed dwellings do not enable direct overlooking into adjacent off site dwellings either.
48. It must be noted that due to the orientation of the dwellings and their relationship to each other, a marginal degree of visibility into the garden of each property may be possible from the upper floor windows. However, given that two of the windows serve bedrooms and one serves the landing, persistent overlooking which would give rise to an unacceptable impact on residential amenity is not judged to arise.
49. The submitted block plan shows indicative landscaping between the two properties and although these details have not been shown in sufficient detail to enable its implementation to be conditioned, as vegetation matures and thickens, this too serves to combat potential concerns with respect to overlooking and loss of amenity as it offers additional screening which can obscure views from windows which may otherwise be able to look across the rear elevation and 'in' to the affected garden. To address the shortcoming in the submitted landscaping details, a condition which requires the submission of an accurate landscaping scheme will be imposed, as set out within the conditions section.
50. In considering the amenity of the potential occupants, the space attributed to the proposed gardens has been considered in detail. The gardens which are provided - whilst not necessarily generous - are deemed to be an appropriate size for the dwellings they serve. However, regard must also be had to the permitted development rights which, upon completion, *would* be afforded to the dwellings by virtue of the General Permitted Development Order (2015).
51. In this instance, if either of the dwellings were to be extended under PD, the plots would potentially appear cramped & squeezed and it is certainly fair to note that if the proposal under consideration had a greater footprint and less garden, the LPA would have attempted to negotiate on this. Larger sprawling footprints in this instance would likely be harmful to amenity and result in a development which is too contrived to meet the requirements of CS5, DM2 or DM22. Accordingly, to prevent the scheme from being undermined in this way, it is proposed to impose a condition which removes permitted development rights to extend, enlarge or alter either unit. This is not to say that the permission would be refused but it allows any such

enlargement to appropriately considered with respect to its impact on prevailing residential amenity and thus within the confines of CS5, DM2 and DM22.

52. Overall, despite the above and whilst it is noted that some infrequent views into the gardens of the proposed dwellings by their counterparts may be possible, this is not judged to represent a significant or substantial conflict with DM2, DM22 or paragraph 127 of the NPPF.

Noise from nearby military operations

53. The application site is close to an operational airfield, being located within the 66db noise contour for RAF Lakenheath (as set out in "A Report on a Military Aviation Noise Contour of F15MK/C and F15MK/E Aircraft Activity at RAF Lakenheath January 2017" (Report: OEM/08/17)).

54. The application site is therefore located within an area affected by noise generated by military aircraft operating from an MOD establishment operated by the United States Air Force (USAF).

55. Paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) states that "Existing businesses and facilities should not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result of development after they were permitted" before going on to require the applicant or agent of change to "provide suitable mitigation before the development has been completed."

56. In response to the applicant's submitted noise assessment, the MOD have commented as follows:

"The content of the submitted Noise Impact Assessment is noted, however, the total sound reduction performance of the passive ventilation is not quantified in the report and this should be equal to or higher than the noise reduction of the proposed glazing. It is recommended that a condition be added to any permission granted requiring the applicant to secure this and carry out the development in accordance with the approved details. Subject to such a condition it is considered the proposed mitigation would be sufficient to minimise the noise impact currently experienced due to military aviation"

57. In light of these comments, a condition will be imposed which requires the performance of the passive ventilation to be submitted to and approved in writing before the dwellings are occupied.

58. The submitted Noise Impact Assessment (NIA) also sets out how the development will mitigate against the locality's aircraft noise and this has been reviewed by the Public Health and Housing Officer who has raised no objection to the submitted content. As such, given the requirements of policy DM2, a condition requiring compliance with the measures set out within the NIA will be imposed.

Ecological impacts

59. As required by the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) at paragraphs 8c, 170 and 175 the LPA have a duty to consider the conservation of biodiversity and to ensure that valued landscapes or sites of biodiversity are protected when determining planning applications. At a local level, this is exhibited through FHDC Core Strategy policy CS2, and policies DM11 and DM12 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document.

60. The National Planning Policy Framework (2019) indicates that when determining planning applications, local planning authorities must aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity and that opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged (Paragraph 175). This is underpinned by Paragraph 8 of the Framework, which details the three overarching objectives that the planning system should try to achieve and it is here that the Framework indicates that planning should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment.

61. In this instance given that the application site already forms part of a residential curtilage and is adjacent to existing built development with the RAF base further south, the net gain in one extra dwelling is not judged to represent development which would warrant or require any supporting ecological surveys or information.

62. However, in accordance with policy DM12 which advises that ecological enhancement measures should be sought where possible and relevant, a condition which requires the submission of such measures can be secured by condition. Such measures would be for the applicant to decipher but they could include bat boxes, hedgehog holes or other such measures which contribute positively to the locality's biodiversity.

Highway implications

63. The 2019 NPPF at paragraph 110 provides that applications for planning permission should, where it is possible to do so, enable safe use of public highways for all stakeholders. The extent to which this is required will of course be dependent upon and commensurate to the scale of development proposed.

64. Policy DM2 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document (2015) also requires proposals to maintain or enhance the safety of the highway network.

65. Accordingly, given that this proposal connects to the public highway (A1101), formal comments from the Highway Authority have been sought. In their formal response dated 10th March 2020, the Highway Authority have confirmed that they wish to raise no objection and would require the imposition of conditions to control the following:

- Surface treatment of the development's access
- Retention of parking spaces
- Submission of bin / refuse areas

66. In addition, policy DM46 requires proposals to comply with the latest adopted parking standards as may prevail at the time of determination. The 2019 Suffolk Guidance for parking document (SCC) must therefore be

considered and this requires dwellings with 4 beds or more to provide 3 spaces per dwelling. Where this parking is shared as opposed to tightly allocated, the Highway Authority are able to reduce their requirement as the use of fluid or floating spaces is less likely to result in cars being displaced onto the highway.

67.In this instance, the submitted block plan illustrates that there will be 6 spaces available across the two dwellings and this has enabled the Highway Authority to offer a comment of no objection.

68.Accordingly, this element of the proposal is judged to meet the requirements of DM2 and DM46 insofar as they relate to highway safety and parking.

Electric Charge Points for Vehicles

69.Section 3.4.2 of the Suffolk Guidance for Parking provides that "Access to charging points should be made available in every residential dwelling." Policy DM2(I) and DM46 seek to ensure compliance with the parking standards and to promote more sustainable forms of transport.

70.The 2019 NPPF at paragraph 105 seeks to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles and para 110 (d) provides that 'within this context, applications for development should be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations.' In addition, DM14 of the Joint Development Management Planning Policies Document seeks to ensure that development proposals include measures, where relevant, to limit emissions and reduce pollution.

71.On this basis a condition will be attached to the permission to ensure an operational electric charge point is delivered to each dwelling.

S106 for affordable housing

72.As set out within the relevant heading above, a 30% contribution towards affordable housing is required to satisfy policy CS9. This is calculated as being 30% of the value of 1 residential unit. The financial figure that this represents (£30,000) has been shared with the applicant who has agreed to enter into such an agreement.

73.At the time of writing this report however, the S106 agreement has not been signed. Planning permission can only be granted once the agreement has been signed however and therefore, should this application be approved, it would be subject to the completion and signing of the S106 agreement.

Conclusion & planning balance

74.In conclusion, whilst the proposal represents a technical conflict in principle due to the site's location beyond the settlement boundary of Beck Row, significant harm does not arise from the proposal to warrant a refusal. As set out above, the re-development of the plot represents an opportunity to enhance the existing character and sense of place which is presently undermined due to a visual break in the built form. This enhancement weighs in favour of the development.

75.Despite being on land which is classified as being countryside, the site is not open unspoiled rural land as policy DM5 seeks to protect. It is, however, flanked by existing residential development within a location which would be considered as sustainable with respect to the proximity of the settlement boundary.

76.Neither the replacement dwelling nor the proposed dwelling strictly comply with policies SA1, CS1, CS10 or DM5 but given the site's context, its proximity to the settlement boundary, the lack of visual harm arising and the benefit with respect to the continuity of the built form which would derive, the conflict with the development plan is judged to be sufficiently outweighed in this particular instance to enable a recommendation that planning permission be granted.

Recommendation:

77.It is recommended that planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the below conditions and the completion of a S106 agreement to secure the required 30% contribution towards affordable housing:

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than 3 years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the following approved plans and documents:

Reference No:	Plan Type	Date Received
Location Plan	Location Plan	08.10.2019
dB/The Grove/10042/SR/0 01	Acoustic Report	08.10.2019
1783/Rpt 2v1	Remediation Strategy	08.10.2019
2207 / SK4 PLOT 1	Proposed Elevations & Floor Plans	01.02.2020
2207 / SK3B PLOT 2	Proposed Elevations & Floor Plans	01.02.2020
2207 / LO (-) 01E	Proposed Block Plan	01.02.2020

Reason: To define the scope and extent of this permission.

- 3 No development above slab level shall take place until samples of all external facing materials (bricks and tiles) to be used on plot 1 and plot 2 as approved by this permission have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area, in accordance with policy DM2 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies.

- 4 The site preparation and construction works, including road works, shall only be carried out between the hours of:

08:00 to 18:00 Mondays to Fridays
08:00 - 13.30 Saturdays

And at no times during Sundays or Bank Holidays without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenity of occupiers of adjacent properties from noise and disturbance, in accordance with policies DM2 and DM14 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies.

- 5 Prior to commencement of development, including any works of demolition, a Construction Method Statement shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall provide for:

- i) The parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors
- ii) Loading and unloading of plant and materials
- vi) Measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction
- vii) A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works
- viii) Hours of construction operations including times for deliveries and the removal of excavated materials and waste

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory development of the site and to protect the amenity of occupiers of adjacent properties from noise and disturbance, in accordance with policies DM2 and DM14 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapter 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies. This condition requires matters to be agreed prior to commencement to ensure that appropriate arrangements are put into place before any works take place on site that are likely to impact the area and nearby occupiers.

- 6 The development hereby approved shall be carried out in complete accordance with the construction and mitigation measures set out within the submitted Noise Impact Assessment (Document Ref: dB/The Grove/10042/SR/001)

Reason: to protect the amenity of future occupiers in accordance with DM2 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document

- 7 Prior to occupation, details of the sound reduction performance of the passive ventilation to be used in both dwellings (plot 1 and plot 2) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: to protect the amenity of future occupiers in accordance with DM2 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document

- 8 Prior to the properties hereby permitted being first occupied, the vehicular access onto The Grove shall be properly surfaced with a bound material for a minimum distance of 10 metres from the edge of the metalled carriageway, in accordance with details previously submitted to and

approved
in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To secure appropriate improvements to the vehicular access in the interests of highway safety

- 9 The areas to be provided for storage of Refuse/Recycling bins as shown on Drawing No. 2207/L0(-)01E shall be provided in its entirety before the development is brought into use and shall be retained thereafter for no other purpose.

Reason: To ensure that refuse recycling bins are not stored on the highway causing obstruction and dangers for other users.

- 10 The dwellings hereby approved shall not be occupied until the area within the site shown on Drawing No. 2207/L0(-)01E for the purposes of manoeuvring and parking of vehicles and for the purposes of secure cycle storage have been provided and thereafter that those areas shall be retained and used for no other purposes.

Reason: To ensure that sufficient space for the on site parking of vehicles is provided and maintained in order to ensure the provision of adequate on-site space for the parking and manoeuvring of vehicles where on-street parking and manoeuvring would be detrimental to highway safety to users of the highway.

- 11 Prior to first occupation, all dwellings with off street parking shall be provided with an operational electric vehicle charge point at reasonably and practicably accessible locations, with an electric supply to the charge point capable of providing a 7kW charge.

Reason: To promote and facilitate the uptake of electric vehicles on the site in order to minimise emissions and ensure no deterioration to the local air quality, in accordance with Policy DM14 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document, paragraphs 105 and 110 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Suffolk Parking Standards.

- 12 The dwelling(s) hereby approved shall not be occupied until the optional requirement for water consumption (110 litres use per person per day) in part G of the Building Regulations has been complied with and evidence of compliance has been obtained.

Reason: To ensure that the proposal meets with the requirements of sustainability, in accordance with policy DM7 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapter 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies.

- 13 No development above ground level shall take place until a scheme of soft landscaping for the site drawn to a scale of not less than 1:200, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include accurate indications of the position, species, girth, canopy spread and height of all existing trees and hedgerows on and adjacent to the site and details of any to be retained, together with measures for their protection during the course of development. Any retained trees removed, dying or becoming seriously damaged or diseased

within five years of commencement shall be replaced within the first available planting season thereafter with planting of similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent for any variation. The works shall be completed in accordance with the approved plans and in accordance with a timetable to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To enhance the appearance of the development and to ensure that the most vulnerable trees are adequately protected during the periods of construction, in accordance with policies DM2, DM12 and DM13 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapters 12 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies.

- 14 Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2 Part 1 Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order amending, revoking or re-enacting that Order), the dwellings hereby approved shall not be extended or altered in any way without the prior written agreement of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area and the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with policies DM2 and DM22 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies.

- 15 Prior to the dwellings hereby approved being occupied, details of biodiversity enhancement measures to be installed at the site, including details of the timescale for installation, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any such measures as may be agreed shall be installed in accordance with the agreed timescales and thereafter retained as so installed. There shall be no occupation unless and until details of the biodiversity enhancement measures to be installed have been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To secure biodiversity enhancements commensurate with the scale of the development, in accordance with policies DM11 and DM12 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapter 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies

Documents:

All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online [DC/19/1952/FUL](#)