

## **Development Control Committee** **6 March 2024**

### **Planning Application DC/22/1193/RM – Land South of Rougham Hill, Rougham Hill, Bury St Edmunds**

<b>Date registered:</b>	6 July 2022	<b>Expiry date:</b>	8 March 2024
<b>Case officer:</b>	Peter White	<b>Recommendation:</b>	Approve application
<b>Parish:</b>	Bury St Edmunds Town Council	<b>Ward:</b>	Southgate Ward
<b>Proposal:</b>	Reserved matters application - submission of details under DC/15/2483/OUT - means of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the construction of 363 dwellings in total (including 109 affordable homes) and associated car parking; access roads; playing pitch; landscaping; open space; play areas; sustainable urban drainage (SuDS) and infrastructure		
<b>Site:</b>	Land South of Rougham Hill, Rougham Hill, Bury St Edmunds		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Hopkins Homes Ltd		

**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:**

Peter White

Email: [democratic.services@westsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@westsuffolk.gov.uk)

Telephone: 01284 757357

## **Background:**

**The application was considered by the Delegation Panel on 16 January 2024 following an objection from Bury St Edmunds Town Council.**

**The Panel referred the application to Development Control Committee for further consideration.**

## **Proposal:**

1. The Reserved Matter application seeks permission for 363 dwellings (including 109 affordable homes) on a strategic residential allocation. This application includes the southern part of a relief road that is a requirement of the allocation. This application also includes associated car parking, access roads, play pitches, landscaping, open space, play areas, sustainable urban drainage and associated infrastructure. Outline planning permission for the site was granted under DC/15/2824/OUT. The details of that application are set out below.
2. The application site excludes two parcels of land that have been reserved for a new primary school and a community use.
3. The application has been amended since it was originally submitted. The layout has overall been designed to comply with the approved design parameter plans established under the outline permission. The changes received have included the following:
  - Providing 2ha of additional multifunctional green infrastructure throughout the southern neighbourhood, exceeding that required by the outline permission and delivering additional landscape and biodiversity benefits;
  - Increase in the use of swales, and other sustainable drainage measures throughout the scheme and increasing tree planting along main streets;
  - Creating a wider green corridor running east - west between the new school site and Nowton Park to facilitate active travel, with enhanced avenue tree planting along the corridor and around the play area as a focal point to the scheme;
  - Increasing the width of the green buffer and planting along the southern boundary with the open countryside, enabling the creation of a lower density softer rural edge and underground of existing overhead power lines, with higher density homes focussed more centrally along the spine road;
  - Adding 1,600m of walking and cycling routes around the edge of the site to complement segregated cycle provision already incorporated into the main spine road design;
  - Amending the location of affordable homes and amendments to the design of both market and affordable homes to enhance overall appearance of the scheme (supporting housing type drawings and street scenes have been provided);
  - Amending the layout to meet highway, parking and waste collection technical requirements, to ensure efficient operation;
  - Minimising the use of frontage parking along the spine road, Sicklesmere Road frontages and the southern rural boundary and extending hedge planting to screen and soften the overall appearance of parking in these locations.

### **Application supporting material:**

4. The application is supported by a number of plans and assessments. They include the following:
  - Location plan
  - Planning Layout
  - Materials Plan
  - Boundary Treatment Plan Street Scenes
  - Parking Plan
  - Bin drag distance Plan
  - Elevations and floor plans of the proposed dwellings
  - Elevations and floor plans of the proposed garages
  - Landscape plans for on plot and off plot
  - Public Open Space plans
  - Technical highway and drainage plans
  - Planning Statement
  - Noise Statement
  - River Lark Enhancement Strategy
  - Landscaper Statement
  - Ecological Mitigation Strategy

### **Site details:**

5. This application site relates to all of the land south of the River Lark within the outline planning permission/ the strategic allocation. The site has agricultural fields to the south, the A143 (Sicklesmere Road) to the west with Nowton Park beyond. To the north west are residential properties which either back onto the A143 or front onto it. The River Lark acts as a natural barrier on the north and eastern boundaries of this application site.
6. This part of the allocation is entirely within a wider local designation known as a Special Landscape Area which carries on to the south and east but wraps around the southern part of Bury Edmunds and extends much further west.

### **Planning history:**

7. 2010 – The direction of growth is allocated in the St Edmundsbury Borough Council Core Strategy as one of the five strategic residential directions of growth around the town of Bury St Edmunds.
8. May 2013 – A Concept Statement was Adopted by the Council for the site.
9. September 2014 - Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031 document is adopted. This Local Plan document allocates and defines the allocation.
10. September 2015 – A Masterplan for the site is adopted by the Council.
11. March 2020 – Outline planning permission (DC/15/2483/OUT) approved for Outline Planning Application (Means of Access) to be considered) on to Rougham Hill and Sicklesmere Road) to include up to 1250 dwellings (Use Class C3); local centre comprising retail floor space (A1, A2, A3, A4 and

A5), a community hall (D2), land for a primary school (D1), and car parking: a relief road, vehicular access and associated works including bridge over the river Lark: sustainable transport links: open space (including childrens play areas): sustainable drainage (SuDS): sports playing fields: allotments and associated ancillary works

- 12.2022 - The site allocation which straddles land north and south of the River Lark is acquired by two separate house builders. Land north of the river (known as the northern neighbourhood) is being developed by Denbury Homes and land south of the river (known as the southern neighbourhood) is being brought forward by Hopkins Homes.
13. Northern neighbourhood – Two Reserved Matter (RM) applications have been brought forward by Denbury Homes to date. One RM application (DC/22/1804/RM) related to the northern part of the relief road and was approved in 2023. A second RM application seeks consent for the 1<sup>st</sup> phase of housing (174 dwellings) that Denbury are proposing. That application (DC/23/0738/RM) remains undetermined to date. Other minor applications have also been approved for temporary construction accesses and an electrical substation.
14. Application DC/23/0978/RM | Reserved matters application - submission of details under DC/15/2483/OUT - appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for bridge over the River Lark providing a two-way vehicular access together with shared cycle and pedestrian ways, sustainable urban drainage, landscaping, and associated works b. including details reserved by conditions 10 and 12 of DC/15/2483/OUT | Land South Rougham Hill Rougham Hill Bury St Edmunds Suffolk Currently undetermined.
15. A number of Discharge of Condition applications have been concurrently submitted alongside the Reserved Matter application.

### **Consultations:**

16. The application has been subject to amendments and additional information has been submitted during the application to address concerns raised. The consultation responses set out below represent a summary of the latest responses received.
17. Full copies of consultation responses are available to view online through the Council's public access system

### **Environment Agency**

18. No objection to the Reserved Matter application. Recommended the discharge of Condition 20 which demonstrates that the proposals can fully compensate for the losses of floodplain storage associated with the River Lark.

### **SCC Flood and Water Management / LLFA**

19. Object to the original submission. No objection to the amended details.

## **Suffolk County Council (Highways – Development Management)**

20. Objected to the original submission. Confirmed that the September 2023 amendments improved the submission significantly particularly the widening and addition of a number of foot/ cycleways around the site. Recommended a number of conditions. The November 2023 comments did request a number of further refinements and these related to refuse bin collection arrangements and parking provision.

## **Suffolk County Council (Rights of way Officer)**

21. Object to the original scheme on the basis that some of the walking routes around the site were not tarmac and too narrow and did not accommodate other modes of active travel like the bicycle. Another concern related to the lack of a sustainable car free route on the north west boundary of the development. The requested amendments have been made and verbal confirmation has been received that the objection can now be removed.

## **Natural England:**

22. Standing Advice issued.

## **West Suffolk Council Strategy and Enabling Officer, Housing**

23. Objected to the original submission as there were concerns regarding clustering and mix of dwelling types. However, the officer confirmed that the amended layout overcame these concerns and that the amended layout and revised housing mix are acceptable.

## **Place Services – Ecology Officer**

24. No objection to the amended details submitted. Recommend conditions to ensure that the ecological appraisal recommendations are secured and Wildlife sensitive lighting design scheme is secured.

## **Place Services – Arboricultural Officer**

25. No objection. Recommend conditions that require written consent of any proposed trees to be felled and details of the proposed landscaping to be agreed.

## **Place Services – Landscape Officer**

26. Objected to the original submission and the first set of amended plans. The concerns related to submitted details for the public open space, details on the play area and on-plot landscaping. However, the final comments received acknowledge the amendments have addressed the concerns raised. Final details for the play areas are requested to be conditioned.

## **West Suffolk Private Sector Housing and Environmental Health**

27. No objection to the details submitted. Also confirmed the details are acceptable to discharge the concurrent discharge of condition application relating to protection of residential amenity.

## **West Suffolk Council – Waste Services**

28. Concerns raised to the original scheme. Following a mini workshop with the Waste Service officers and the Highway Authority engineers amendments were worked up by the developers. The amendments were reviewed by the waste services officers who have confirmed that the amended layout allows the refuse vehicles to efficiently travel around the development and collect household waste.

## **West Suffolk Council – Environment Team**

29. Comments relate to EV charging provision which is covered by condition 22 on the outline permission.

## **Suffolk County Council (Planning and obligations officer)**

30. No objection as the outline planning permission secured the relevant necessary obligations.

## **National Highways**

31. No objection

## **Suffolk County Council (Minerals and Waste Authority)**

32. No objection

## **Anglian Water**

33. Generic comments received relate to promotion of SuDs to manage surface water drainage and asking the LPA to consult the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA).

## **West Suffolk Council – Parks and Infrastructure Manager**

34. Satisfied with the locations of the play areas as shown and acknowledges that they broadly accord with the location shown in the approved parameter plans. States that the locations will enable older children and young teenagers across the development to access a play area without the need to cross the relief road. Requests the details of the play areas are conditioned so the LPA can ensure the equipment is acceptable and passive surveillance is maximised.

## **Suffolk and North East Essex Integrated Care Board**

35. Made a request for a contribution to primary care. Officers discussed with the Strategic Estates Planning Manager at the ICB that contributions for primary care had already been secured under the outline application and that an additional payment could not be secured. Officer accepted that they had not recognised that this was a reserved matter application and that they had already secured funding necessary to make this allocation acceptable.

## **Representations:**

### Bury St Edmunds Town Council;

36. The Bury Town Council have made three comments on the application during its lifetime:

11 Aug 2022

That based on information received, Bury St Edmunds Town Council recommends refusal on grounds of insufficient information on layout design, inadequate highways information and no reference WSC commitment to a Zero Carbon Footprint.

13 April 2023

Based on information received Bury St Edmunds Town Council recommends refusal due to concerns regarding design, layout, density and lack of green spaces; environmental concerns remain and we note the lack of zero carbon commitments

12 Oct 2023

Based on information received Bury St Edmunds Town Council upholds its previous objection.

37. Two letters of objection have been received from residents in the villages of Cockfield and Clare to the application as originally submitted. No comments were received to either of the amendments submitted.

One letter objects to the development as it will generate unacceptable traffic generation particularly on Southgate roundabout. The development doesn't include a new GP surgery and it will harm archaeology and is proposed on land vulnerable to flooding.

One objection was also received concerning the layout of the development, how it should include more trees, stronger street scenes and reflect the existing Sicklesmere Road.

## **Policy:**

38. 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. 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 St Edmundsbury Borough Council.
39. The following policies of the Joint Development Management Policies Document (adopted Feb 2015), the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy (adopted Dec 2010), the St Edmundsbury Borough Council Local Policies Map Book (adopted Feb 2015) and the Bury St Edmunds Vision

2031 Document (adopted Sept 2014) have been taken into account in the consideration of this application:

Joint Development Management Policies Document (2015):

Policy DM2 – Creating Places – Development Principles and Local Distinctiveness.

Policy DM3 – Masterplans

Policy DM6 – Flooding and Sustainable Drainage.

Policy DM10 – Impact of Development on Sites of Biodiversity and Geodiversity Importance.

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 DM22 – Residential Design.

Policy DM42 – Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities.

Policy DM44 – Rights of Way.

Policy DM46 – Parking Standards.

Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031 (2014)

Policy BV2 – Housing Development within Bury St Edmunds.

Policy BV7 – Strategic Site – South East Bury St Edmunds.

Policy BV26 – Green Infrastructure in Bury St Edmunds

St Edmundsbury Core Strategy December (2010).

Policy CS1 (Spatial Strategy)

Policy CS2 (Sustainable Development)

Policy CS3 (Design and Local Distinctiveness)

Policy CS7 (Sustainable Transport)

Policy CS8 (Strategic Transport Improvements)

Policy CS11 (Bury St Edmunds Strategic Growth)

### **Other planning policy:**

40. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was revised in September 2023 and is a material consideration in decision making from the day of its publication. Paragraph 219 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 2023 NPPF that full weight can be attached to them in the decision-making process.

41. Cycle Infrastructure Design Local Transport Note 01/2020 Published July 2020 Department for Transport Gear Change: A bold vision for cycling and walking Rights of Way improvement Plan "Suffolk Green Access Strategy" published 2020.



42.The following adopted Supplementary Planning Documents are relevant to this planning application:

South-East Bury St Edmunds Masterplan Document (adopted September 2015)

**Officer comment:**

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

- Principle of Development
- Landscape matters
- Highway matters
- Design and impact
- Surface Water Drainage matters
- Energy and sustainability
- Other considerations

**Principle of Development**

44.The principle of residential development on this strategic residential allocation was confirmed by the grant of the outline planning permission DC/15/2843/OUT in accordance with Policies CS1, BV2, BV7 and CS11. That application, as detailed above was for up to 1250 dwellings across the entire allocation. The approved parameter plans under the outline demonstrated that the southern neighbourhood, which this application relates to, would also accommodate a community building and a primary school. Whilst this application does not include those elements the land has been set aside for them and they are shown indicatively. The principle of development has been previously established the remaining report covers the other material considerations for this reserved matter application.

**Landscape matters**

45.Core Strategy Policy CS2 seeks to achieve, amongst other things , conservation or, where possible, enhancement of the character and quality of local landscapes and the wider countryside and public access to them. Policy CS3 requires development proposals to consider protection of the landscape and historic views. Policy CS11, which identifies south east Bury St Edmunds as one of the locations to accommodate new growth, requires new development to positively use the framework created by the natural environment and character of the area.

46.Policy DM13 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document seeks to protect the landscape character (including Special Landscape Areas (SLA)) from the potentially adverse impacts of development. The policy seeks proportionate consideration of landscape impacts and calls for the submission of new landscaping where appropriate. It also calls for landscape mitigation and compensation measures so there is no net loss of characteristic features.

47.The application site sits within the locally designated Special Landscape Area (SLA). The local landscape is thus considered to be a `valued

landscape' for the purposes of the NPPF. The SLA designation incorporates the River Lark, where it crosses the application site and the agricultural fields in the southern neighbourhood.

48. The approved Landscape and Parameter Plan at outline stage sets out where greenspace and green corridors would go on the southern neighbourhood. The development would provide 2ha of additional multifunctional green infrastructure throughout the southern neighbourhood, exceeding that required by the outline permission and delivering additional landscape and biodiversity benefits.
49. The parameter plan showed a meaningful green corridor on the southwestern boundary. This has been increased during the planning process with additional planting to further mitigate any potential landscape harm from the development, particularly when viewed from the south.
50. The landscape parameter plan also indicated an important green corridor that would link the primary school site with Nowton Park. The application delivers this anticipated corridor, and whilst it is in a slightly different location it is wider than originally envisaged which is seen as a significant enhancement to the development.
51. The relief road has landscaping alongside it in a form that echoes what was envisaged in both the masterplan and the outline application. Objection was raised by a third party on the lack of trees along the spine road. Amended details were submitted which proposed more trees along the relief road and other main roads. It is considered that an acceptable balance between trees, sustainable urban drainage features and walking and cycling infrastructure has been found within the application and that the development will be viewed, in the fullness of time as a well landscaped development.
52. Overall, the application is considered to deliver the amount of landscaping both within the development and on the edges (particularly along the river corridor) as the adopted Masterplan and the outline permission envisaged. This accords with Policies DM2, DM3, DM22, DM10, DM12, DM13 and BV26.

## **Highway matters**

53. Numerous highway matters were dealt with at the outline stage and are not being reconsidered with this application. Of particular note, the outline dealt with the principle of 1250 dwellings, a primary school and a local centre and assessed the impact the development would have on the surrounding highway network. It also secured the necessary mitigation which related to the alteration of a number of key junctions like the Southgate Green roundabout and the Rougham Hill corridor. Lastly it agreed the details of the two main vehicular entrances to the site that would link the proposed relief road to the existing highway network. For this application it related to the new roundabout proposed on Sicklesmere Road opposite Nowton Park.
54. Whilst the outline application assessed a number of important highway matters this reserved matters application still needs assessing to evaluate other important motorised and non motorised transport aspects. Of

particular note are car parking provision, highway safety of the road network and aspects of the proposed layout that relate to walking and cycling infrastructure.

55. Statutory planning policies set out that walking and cycling shall be prioritised over other modes of transport. Additionally, officers are aware that the government has relatively recently set up Active Travel England (within the Department for Transport) to help promote all modes of active travel within new development. Guidance on the promotion of walking and cycling is also published in *"Gear Change: A bold vision for cycling and walking"* and *"LTN01/2020"*.
56. A number of changes have occurred with the application during the planning process in order to ensure that walking and cycling are adequately provided for. These include amongst other things;
- the widening of the cycling and walking provision either side of the relief road from a 3 metre shared path to 4 metre shared paths;
  - The amendment of the main walking and cycling corridor that will link the primary school site to the new entrance into Nowton Park to give more priority and directness to that sustainable route;
  - The widening of the ped/ cycle provision alongside the A134, and on the south east and north east boundaries from a 2 metre wide gravel path to a 3 metre wide tarmac surface;
  - The introduction of a 3 metre wide tarmac cycle/ footway that would link the proposed relief road with the existing cycle/ footway provision on Sicklemere Road in the north west corner. This would form part of a longer car free route linking the new hospital with the Moreton Hall area and beyond.
57. The Highway Authority and officers are now satisfied that the proposal will create a development that delivers a significant number of attractive, direct car free routes, that allow people to travel through the development and around it safely and comfortably. Officers are entirely satisfied that the proposal meets both the extensive policy requirement to prioritise walking and cycling and echo's the design principles in the relevant guidance and in accordance with policy DM44, BV26, CS7, CS8 and CS11
58. The Highway Authority have assessed the scheme for visitor and resident parking against the provisions of the Suffolk County Council Parking Standards. Triple parking is not supported in the parking standards and the developer has worked hard to remove this where possible from their original submission. However, 12 plots do still have triple parking in order to meet the minimum parking standards (there are other incidences, but this is where there is an over provision) and this equates to 3% of the properties proposed. Other incidences of triple parking (where it isn't to meet a minimum requirement) occur on private drives and with garages. It is recognised that often garages are not used for parking and often private drives are used by the residents who live there for informal parking so the issues with triple parking are much less acute. On balance it is considered that whilst there are some minor deviations from the standards overall the scheme accords with policies DM46, DM2 and DM22.
59. The WSC Waste Team originally objected to the scheme in terms of the layout and how refuse vehicles would not be able to move around the site

efficiently to collect bins on a weekly basis. The applicant worked with the Highway Authority and the WSC Waste Team to amend the scheme to ensure it was acceptable. This included making some private access drives adopted highway and relocating bin collection points so waste operatives have a minimal distance to walk to collect the household waste. The scheme is now considered acceptable and accords with Policy DM2.

60. The development is considered acceptable in terms of parking, waste collection, highway safety and prioritising walking and cycling.

## **Design and impact**

61. The design and Access Statement that was submitted with the outline planning application discussed strategic approaches to key design matters. Furthermore, a range of illustrative concept plans were submitted with the outline planning applications to demonstrate how site is likely to be progressed at reserved matters stage (with particular regard to strategic landscaping, open spaces, location of the key buildings, the route of the relief road etc). Furthermore, the adopted Masterplan provided a framework and aspirations for high quality buildings against which later detailed proposals will be benchmarked.

62. The objection from the Town council sets out that they have concerns regarding design, layout, density. They do not specify what specific concerns they have. Objection was also received from a third party concerning the layout of the development, how it should include more trees, stronger street scenes and reflect the existing Sicklesmere Road. Development to the north along Sicklesmere Road is made up of frontage development that has individual vehicular plot access directly onto Sicklesmere Road/ A143. Neither the Masterplan nor the approved parameter plans envisaged this part of the allocation having frontage development onto Sicklesmere Road with each plots having their own access onto this main arterial road. Officers disagree that the development should reflect the existing Sicklesmere Road as this would not accord with the Masterplan for the site and would potentially cause highway safety issues.

63. As discussed above under the landscape section the proposed landscape is considered sufficient and in keeping with how this part of the allocation was going to be brought forward. It is considered by officers that the scheme has good landscaping on the boundaries of the development parcel and throughout.

64. The design of some of the dwellings has been altered during the planning process. The changes that have been submitted are regarded as positive. There were a small number of dwellings, as originally submitted that had minor elements that needed amending as they were considered weak in design terms and not of high architectural quality in accordance with policy DM22. Some of the buildings did not incorporate characteristics of local building design like having regard to the "window hierarchy" that are a requirement of local plan policy. The amended details ensured that the dwellings as amended are appropriate with solid design principles being followed.

65. The overall design density of the proposal is considered to be in keeping with the approved density parameter plan that was submitted and approved at the outlines stage. This includes a lower density on the periphery of the site, which is the interface with the countryside and higher density development is located more centrally. Additionally, the proposal includes landmark buildings, of particular note are those around the southern new roundabout which proposes a strong building form curved around the northern boundary of the roundabout which is considered by officers to create a welcoming gateway feature.
66. Overall officers consider that the proposal is in keeping with the parameters that were set out the outline stage and that the development is well landscaped, of high architectural quality with good buildings lines and will create a strong sense of place. This accords with DM2, DM22, CS3 and the adopted masterplan.

### **Surface Water Drainage matters**

67. Policy DM6 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document sets out surface water information requirements for planning applications. Policies for flood risk set out in the Framework aim to steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding. The Framework policies also seek to ensure that new development does not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.
68. Some of the application site is within flood zone 2 and 3. These zones are narrow corridors of Flood Zone 2 and 3 are present along localised areas along the River Lark. These highest risk areas within the application are proposed as open green space and ecological buffer zones which are classified as Water Compatible under the NPPF Planning Practice Guidance. Accordingly, none of the built development proposed (including the land left for the community facility and primary school) is within flood zones 2 and 3 (the areas most at risk).
69. Objection was received from a third party concerning the site's location within flood zones 2 and 3 it should be noted that the applicant has worked with the LLFA and the Environment Agency extensively to ensure they have no concerns or objection. The application will also deliver benefits relating to quantity and quality water. Of particular note is the improvements that will be delivered to the River Lark which often suffers from prolonged periods of scarcity of water. The proposal would manage surface water across the site more sustainably by slowing the flow of surface water across the site to the river. This will, along with other measures that the development will deliver, increase water quantity in the Lark within periods of drought which will also help overall water quality.
70. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable with regard to flood risk, and the management of surface water drainage in accordance with policy DM6.

### **Energy and sustainability**

71. Objection was received by the Town Council that the development lacks a zero-carbon commitment. There are no national or local planning policies which require development to be zero carbon. Additionally, the outline

permission did not secure the development as a zero carbon development. This application seeks consent for the Reserved Matters only, and energy performance, or sustainability is not a reserved matter.

72. Nevertheless the applicant has set out a number of aspects about the development that are considered worth noting. To meet current building regulations the properties will include;

- Improved fabric, airtightness and thermal bridging performance.
- Design to prevent overheating.
- Improved ventilation.
- Air Source Heat Pumps to all properties (site is all electric with no gas) with underfloor heating to ground floors.
- Electric Vehicle Chargers to all plots with adjacent on plot /garage parking. Detail are required to be agreed under Condition 22.
- Standard Assessment Procedure (SAPs) & Building Regulations England Assessments Part L(BREs) assessments undertaken to demonstrate compliance in meeting Part L.
- All Plots to be photographed, recorded throughout build stages and signed off by SAP assessors and Building Control, as part of the BREL process.

73. Whilst the above does not carry any significant positive benefit in weighing up the acceptability of the overall scheme. It is still viewed as a positive that the developer is moving away from fossil fuel-based heating and seeking to comply with 2025 building regulations across the entire development.

### **Other considerations**

74. There are a number of other elements that have been considered during the processing of this reserved matter application which are not part of a reserved matter application but relate to conditions that are attached to the outline permission and their details could impact reserved matters like layout or landscaping. This section comments on those matters.

75. The Environmental Health Officer has raised no objection to the details that have been submitted concurrently under a discharge of condition application and for information purposes with this application. The submitted details accord with the proposed layout and the mitigation required is secured under the outline permission. Accordingly, the LPA is satisfied that the future occupiers of the proposed development will have a satisfactory level of amenity. This accords with Policy DM14.

76. The Ecologist at Place Services has raised no objection to the submitted details. A concurrent discharge of condition (DCON) application (for condition 9 of the outline permission) has also been submitted and the details submitted for that are also considered acceptable. The ecologist welcomes the River Lark Enhancement Scheme as its delivery will provide an unlit 30m buffer for protected species using the river corridor and notes that the application will deliver over 7ha of semi natural habitats created for the southern neighbourhood phase of this development. Accordingly, the proposal is considered acceptable in this regard and accords with Policies DM10 and DM12

77. The submitted layout shows three separate formal play areas. This accords with the amount of play areas that the approved parameter plans showed would be delivered on this part of the allocation. It is important for children to have access to play areas without the need to cross busy roads as it is known that this would deter parents from allowing older children and younger teenagers to travel to these places unaccompanied. The proposed layout shows two play areas on the eastern side of the relief road and one on the western side, which will allow the whole development to access play areas. The southern area of play was previously shown on the masterplan as being more centrally located than it is proposed now. However, its location on the southern boundary next to the circular walking and cycling route around the site is seen as a benefit and does not draw any concerns. Accordingly, this aspect of the scheme is considered acceptable. Both the Landscape Officer and the Parks and Infrastructure Manager request a condition that requires the final details of the Play Areas to be submitted to and agreed in writing with the LPA. This accords with Policy DM42.

### **Conclusion:**

78. In conclusion, the planning application on balance is considered acceptable. The above report sets out that there is a minor element of the scheme that has triple parking which is contrary to the adopted parking standards but this is not considered to be a significant matter in terms of the overall acceptability of the proposed development. All other elements relating to the reserved matters are considered acceptable and accord with national and local planning policies and other relevant guidance.

### **Recommendation:**

79. It is recommended that planning permission be **APPROVED** subject to following (summarised) conditions:

1. List of approved conditions
2. Restrict the use of the temporary access onto Sicklesmere Road and control its blocking up.
3. The areas to be provided for the storage and presentation for collection/emptying of refuse and recycling bins as shown shall be provided in their entirety.
4. There shall be no occupation of any dwelling until the area(s) within the site shown for the purposes of loading, unloading, manoeuvring and parking of vehicles and bicycle storage serving that dwelling has/have been provided.
5. A timetable/ phasing plan of the of all the hereby pedestrian and cycle routes shall be submitted to and agreed with the LPA. the routes shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed timetable and thereafter retained, maintained and used for no other purposes.
6. No dwelling shall be occupied until the carriageways and footways serving that dwelling have been constructed to at least Binder course level or better in accordance with the approved details.

7. The visibility splays serving the hereby approved road junction(s) must be formed prior to the junctions being used by or being available for use by the general public.
8. Remove PD rights to block any of the visibility splays for the hereby approved junction for the future adopted highway.
9. Details of the Play areas to be agreed along with the timetable for their implementation. The areas must thereafter be maintained and retained as play areas.
10. All mitigation measures and/or works shall be carried out in accordance with the details contained in the Ecological Mitigation Strategy (Wood, June 2022)
11. A lighting design scheme for biodiversity shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
12. Protective fencing as shown in the Arb Method Statement on drawing TR01 sheet 4 Rev V1 shall be installed before development commences on site and must be retained on site throughout the construction period.

**NB – a list of fully worded conditions will be provided as a late paper**

**Documents:**

All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online [DC/22/1193/RM](https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/DC/22/1193/RM)