

Forest Heath District Council

**DEVELOPMENT
CONTROL
COMMITTEE**

7 OCTOBER 2015

DEV/FH/15/036

Report of the Head of Planning and Growth

**PLANNING APPLICATION DC/14/1206/FUL - LAND ADJACENT SMOKE
HOUSE INN, SKELTONS DROVE, BECK ROW**

Synopsis:

Application under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and associated matters.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Committee determine the attached application and associated matters.

CONTACT OFFICER

Case Officer: Philippa Kelly
Telephone: 01284 757382

Committee Report

Date Registered:	1 July 2014	Expiry Date:	31 October 2015 (with agreed extension)
Case Officer:	Philippa Kelly	Recommendation:	APPROVE planning permission, subject to S106 agreement and planning conditions
Parish:	Beck Row	Ward:	Eriswell and the Rows
Proposal:	Proposed residential development of 166 no. market dwellings, including associated public open space, associated accesses, landscaping and ancillary works, including the part retrospective development of 24 residential units (as amended by drawings received 09 July 2015 which proposes 49 affordable housing units).		
Site:	Land Adjacent Smoke House Inn, Skeltons Drove, Beck Row		
Applicant:	Persimmon Homes, Anglia		

BACKGROUND:

This application is referred to the Development Control Committee because it is for 'major development' and objections have been received from Beck Row Parish Council.

The application is recommended for conditional approval following completion of a Section 106 agreement.

APPLICATION PROPOSAL:

1. Full planning permission is sought for the residential development of 166 dwellings, and associated work including highway improvements and landscaping.
2. Construction has already commenced on twenty four of the residential units, in accordance with an extant permission (planning reference F/2203/0177/OUT and 2007/0492/RMA). The Council is satisfied that a lawful start has been made on these dwellings, in accordance with the extant permission. The current

application seeks part retrospective planning permission for the 24 units, to ensure that they are captured by the current planning policy context.

3. The application site comprises two separate parcels of land situated on either side of Skelton's Drove, a single track minor road which runs north-east from the A1101 and bends west. Skelton's Drove is in separate ownership and is not included in the red line boundary of the application site.
4. Access to the development west of Skelton's Drove would be gained from the existing Sycamore Drive estate to the north—west. The site to the east of Skelton's Drove will be accessed by an existing roundabout on the A1101/The Street. The access road passes through the bottom of the site to join Holmsey Green Road. No access is proposed to Skelton's Drove from the application site.
5. The application proposes a mix of 2, 3 and 4 bedroom houses, comprising a mixture of detached, semi detached and terraced properties arranged around cul-de-sacs, private driveways and squares. The development includes a variety of two and two and a half storey dwellings and associated single storey garages.
6. Based on a total number of 166 dwellings and a total site area of approximately 5 hectares, the density of the proposed development will be approximately 32 dwellings per hectare.
7. The scheme as originally submitted in July 2014 was accompanied by a Viability Appraisal which provided the applicant's justification for why the scheme would not be viable with affordable housing.
8. The viability of the scheme was independently reviewed on behalf of the Council. In July 2015 the applicant confirmed amendments to incorporate the on site provision of the full amount of affordable housing required under Policy CS9.
9. The amended scheme proposes a total of 49 affordable units (approximately 29% of the total number of dwellings). These are to be provided across the site as a mix of 1, 2, 3 and 4 bedroom dwellings. The remainder of the units are a mix of 2, 3 and 4 bedroom private market dwellings.
10. A summary of the accommodation schedule is set out as below:

TABLE 1: Accommodation Schedule

	1 BED	2 BED	3 BED	4 BED	TOTAL
MARKET HOUSING	0	46	43	28	117
AFFORDABLE HOUSING	10	26	9	4	49
TOTAL	10	72	52	32	166

11.The proposed palette of external building materials comprises the following:

- Walls – red, mixed red and buff brick, stone and magnolia
- Roofs – terracotta, red and dark grey pantiles.

12.Public open space (a total of 7097 square metres) is proposed in three locations within the site. This includes an area of open space which will link to an existing area adjacent to and outside of the application site. In addition, a five metre structural landscaping strip is proposed along the boundary of the site with Skelton’s Drove, and along the northern boundary of the eastern land parcel, where it abuts open fields.

APPLICATION SUPPORTING MATERIAL:

13.The application is supported by the following documents:

- i. Application forms and drawings.
- ii. Planning Statement.
- iii. Design and Access Statement.
- iv. Transport Statement.
- v. Residential Travel Plan.
- vi. Sustainability Statement.
- vii. Flood Risk and Foul and Storm Water Drainage Assessment.
- viii. Economic Viability Assessment (*this is a confidential document and is not publically available*).
- ix. Ecological Survey.
- x. Tree Survey Schedule.
- xi. Tree Constraints Plan.
- xii. Site Investigation.

SITE DETAILS:

14.The application site is located in the village of Beck Row, in part within the defined settlement boundary. Beck Row is designated as a Primary Village in the Core Strategy Policy CS1. It has a population of 3897 (including Holywell Row and Kenny Hill (2011 Parish Profile).

15.The site is situated centrally within Beck Row, to the north of The Street (A1101). It occupies an area of approximately 5 hectares which is divided into two distinct land parcels which are separated by Skelton’s Drove. Skelton’s Drove is a private road which was owned by Defence Estates until recently. It is understood that it was sold during the summer of 2015.

16.Skelton’s Drove demarks the northern and eastern boundaries of the western land parcel, and part of the western boundary of the eastern land parcel.

17.Land to the immediate north of the application site comprises arable farmland and land which was until recently in the ownership of the RAF. Existing residential development is situated adjacent the site. This includes properties to the north—west which are occupied by USAF personnel.

18. To the south-west of the site is new residential development on the site of the former Smoke House hotel complex. Rear gardens of existing dwellings which front The Street/Locks Lane back onto the southern boundary of the site.
19. Existing residential development is also located adjacent the eastern boundary of the site, which comprises predominately single storey properties. The opposite side of Holmsey Green consists of one and two storey cottages and some local retail/commercial uses.
20. The site is relatively flat with only a gentle rise from west to east. It consists of semi-improved pasture which has been grazed by horses. Within the north-western land parcel are a number of soil mounds which are being stored from the adjacent site.
21. Along the site margins are large areas of bramble and occasional short lengths of hedgerow. A row of mature lime trees is found along the southern boundary to the rear of the Smoke House Inn. Two mature firs are also present within this row.
22. Occasional mature trees can be found along the eastern boundary of the eastern land parcel. Around the site boundaries are long stretches of raised, mostly rough grass-covered bunds and associated dry ditches which appear to have been constructed a number of years ago to prevent vehicular access. There is an area of old concrete hard standing within the eastern land parcel.
23. The Environment Agency flood risk maps indicate that the site is situated within Flood Zone 1 ('little or no risk of flooding').
24. The application site is identified as BR/03 in the Council's Site Allocations Local Plan Further Issues and Options Consultation Document (August 2015).
25. The site has also been included in the Council's Assessment of a five year supply of housing land, which was published in February 2015, and which confirms that there is a 5.1 year supply of housing land in the District. This document identifies the site as available, suitable, achievable and capable of being delivered within a five year timeframe.

AMENDMENTS:

26. During the course of the application, the scheme was amended a number of times.

February 2015 amendments:

- Public open space reconfiguration, including removal of area of open space on northern boundary of south-east land parcel.
- Strengthening of landscaping buffer strip around the site.
- Submission of revised Residential Travel Plan.

July 2015 amendments:

27. On 09 July 2015 the applicant confirmed that a commercial decision to move forward had been made, and amendments to incorporate affordable housing were submitted.
28. Whilst the scheme remains for 166 dwellings, 49 of these are now identified for affordable housing. The changes relate to minor amendments to the site layout plan and certain house types.
29. The July 2015 amendments also address other issues raised during the course of the application:
- Changes to house types, road layout and plot positioning, to reflect the provision of 49 affordable units within the scheme.
 - Revisions to car and cycle parking and internal garage dimensions.
 - Addressing comments made by Suffolk Police Architectural Liaison Officer.
30. An updated Design and Access Statement and Planning Statement were also submitted.

Amendments September 2015

31. Amendments received in September 2015 relate to the following:
- Changes to the affordable housing mix, to reflect consultation comments made by the Council's Strategy and Enabling Officer.
 - Changes to individual dwelling types to reflect third party concerns regarding impact on existing dwellings.
 - Changes to the red line site plan to reflect third party concerns regarding land ownership.
32. Appropriate re-consultation was undertaken in respect of the amendments.

PLANNING HISTORY:

Extant Planning Permission

33. The application site has a lengthy and complex planning history. Most recently, planning permission for the development of the site for 150 dwellings was granted under the following applications:

F/2007/0492/RMA - Reserved matters for 150 dwellings for occupation by USAF personnel (resubmission) (Granted 2008)

F/2003/1077/OUT - Outline planning permission for residential development of the site (Granted 2005).

34. These planning permissions restrict the occupation of the dwellings to United States Air Force (USAF) personnel only. Development has commenced, and 24 dwellings adjacent the junction of The Street and Holmsey Green are at various stages of construction.
35. The Council is satisfied that the 24 units which are currently under construction are being built in accordance with F/2007/0492/RMA and F/2003/1077/OUT. Under the provision of these planning permissions, these dwellings can only be occupied by members of the USAF
36. Under the current application, the 24 units would be unchanged from those approved under the 2007 and 2003 application. The only difference in respect of these dwelling units is that the granting of planning permission for this scheme would remove the occupancy restriction.

Other Planning History

F/2007/0014/RMA – reserved matters for 150 dwellings for occupation by USAF personnel (withdrawn)

F/2002/524/OUT – residential development and means of access for occupation by USAF personnel (Refused).

F/98/568/OUT – Residential development and means of access for occupation by USAF personnel (Refused. Appeal Dismissed).

F/93/260/OUT – Residential development and means of access for occupation by USAF personnel (Refused. Appeal Dismissed).

F/91/611/OUT – Residential development and means of access for occupation by USAF personnel. (Refused. Appeal dismissed).

CONSULTATIONS:

37. Members of the public and statutory consultees were consulted in respect of the scheme as submitted. The following is a summary of statutory comments received in relation to the scheme as originally submitted and as amended.

Scheme submitted with the planning application (July 2014)

38. **West Suffolk Planning Policy – No objection. Comments.** It has been demonstrated that there are clear societal benefits likely to accrue from this proposal. Should you consider that the cumulative impact of this and another recent permissions would be of such significant detriment that it justifies refusal, you should take this course of action. The contention would be that the development does not provide for infrastructure, sufficient to bring it in line with the objectives of sustainable development and that, as a consequence, the future decisions on the scale and location of new development, within this settlement would 'better' be achieved via the plan making process.
39. **West Suffolk Strategic Housing – Objection. Comments.** The Strategic Housing Team does not support the planning application DC/14/1206FUL for Skelton Drove, Beck Row as it is contrary to our Core Strategy Policy CS9. This

development would be subject to 30% affordable housing provision and although a historic application back in 2004 was subject to exceptional planning consent being granted for USAF personnel only this does not apply to this application and should be subject to our current planning policies.

Having regard to the viability appraisal submitted with this application the Strategic Housing Team cannot conclude how using figures from recent developments in Cambridge and Bury St Edmunds bears any relation to the locality of Beck Row, Suffolk as the figures especially for Cambridge are distorted by high land values.

40. **West Suffolk Public Health and Housing – No objection.** Recommends conditions relation to Construction Method Statement, construction hours, waste disposal and demolition.
41. **West Suffolk Environmental Health- No objection. Comments.** Recommends conditions/informatives relating to contamination construction method statement and acoustic installation (unreasonable)
42. **West Suffolk Ecology, Tree and Landscape Officer - Detailed comments provided.** There are a number of constraints to the site that have been identified that need particular consideration. The biodiversity survey includes a population of reptiles which it proposes to be translocated to a receptor site. Details of receptor site, identified measures to secure the site for reptiles in the future and monitoring must be submitted prior to the decision being made.
43. **Suffolk County Council Highways – Comments.** Before full consideration of this application can be given, require minor amendments with regard to parking, permeability, and service strips. Requests S106 contributions for an RTP1 screen which would go next to the shelter on the main road as services are not expected to be diverted.
44. **Suffolk County Council Travel Planner –Comments.** Requests an interim Travel Plan to be submitted
45. **Suffolk County Council Planning Obligations –No objection. Detailed comments.**
46. **Suffolk County Council Minerals and Waste – No objection. Comments.** Requests clarification regarding sustainable use of minerals, raising floor and road levels and soil handling procedures.
47. **Suffolk County Council Public Rights of Way – No objection. Comments.**
48. **Suffolk County Council Archaeological Services – No objection. Comments.** The development area has been fully evaluated, and the area of significant archaeological deposits has also been excavated. A commitment on completing the analysis and reporting on the excavation has also been made by the developer. I am therefore happy that there is no need for an archaeological condition on this application.
49. **Suffolk County Council, Flood and Water Manager – No response received.**

50. **Suffolk County Council, Fire and Rescue – No objection. Comments.** Comment made on 26 June 2006 under F/2007/0492/RM may remain in place for DC/14/1206/FUL.
51. **Anglian Water- No objection. Comments**
52. **Environment Agency – No objection. Comments.** Considers that planning permission could be granted to the proposed development if conditions are included relating to surface water drainage scheme, remediation strategy and contamination.
53. **Suffolk Wildlife Trust – No objection. Comments.** We have read the ecological survey report and note the findings of the consultant. A reptile survey at the site identified an 'exceptional' population of the common lizard and 'low' population of grass snake. The ecological survey report recommends a methodology for the removal of reptiles from the site and states that a receptor site is required to translocate the animals to. However, no receptor site as yet appears to have been identified. We recommend that, should permission be granted, the provision of a receptor site, along with translocation and long term management and monitoring strategy, is secured and implemented via a planning condition, It is also noted that a number of the timings for site works identified in the ecological report are out of date, it should be ensured that any works are undertaken at the appropriate time of the year to avoid harming reptiles.
54. **Natural England – No objection. Comments.** The proposal is in close proximity to the Wilde Street Meadow Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Natural England is satisfied that the proposed development being carried out in strict accordance with the details of the application, as submitted, will not damage or destroy the interest features for which the site has been notified. We therefore advise that this SSSI does not represent a constraint in determining this application. It is not likely to have a significant effect on the interest features for which the Breckland SPA has been classified. Natural England therefore advises that your Authority is not required to undertake an Appropriate Assessment to assess the implications of this proposal on the sites conservation objectives.
55. **Suffolk Constabulary** – Detailed comments in respect of designing out areas which may become crime generators in the future.
56. **Mildenhall Drainage Board. No objection. Comments.** Recommends a condition relating to surface water disposal.
57. **Lawson Planning Partnership on behalf of NHS England - Comments.** The planning application does not include a Healthcare Impact Assessment (HIA) or propose any mitigation of the healthcare impacts arising from the proposed development. An HIA has therefore been prepared by NHSE to provide the basis for a developer contribution towards capital funding to increase capacity within the GP Catchment Area.

NHSE raise a holding objection to the proposed development on the grounds that the applicant has not provided that the application fully delivers

sustainable development, as it does not assess the likely healthcare impacts of the development or provide for the necessary mitigation. Requests a developer contribution of £28 600 to address the identified healthcare impacts.

58. **MoD Safeguarding – no response received.**

Amended Scheme:

59. **West Suffolk Strategic Housing – Comments.** The Strategic Housing Team is currently unable to support the affordable housing mix proposed for the application DC/14/1206/FUL. There are no one bed dwellings within the mix. We would like to see a proportion of these incorporated into the affordable housing mix. Regarding the 3 bed 4 person dwellings, this size property is impractical when taking into account the current changes to housing benefit and the need to maximise occupancy to meet our household needs. We therefore would require our three bed dwellings to occupy a minimum of 5 persons.

We have had no discussions with the applicant regarding the development prior to seeing the above affordable housing mix and therefore based on robust evidence the strategic housing team would be seeking to secure the following affordable housing mix:

- 10 x 1 bed house (2 person)
- 26 x 2 bed house (4 person)
- 9 x 3 bed house (5 person)
- 4 x 4 bed house (6 person)

60. **West Suffolk Ecology, Tree and Landscape Officer – Detailed comments. No objection.**

61. **Suffolk County Council Highways –Comments. No objection.** Recommends that any permission which the Planning Authority may give should include conditions relating to the following - details of bin storage; estate roads and footpaths; carriageways and footways; deliveries management plan; vehicle manoeuvring and parking' easement across Skelton's Drove.

Requests contributions in respect of a Real Time Passenger Information screen; Travel Plan Evaluation and Support; Travel Plan Implementation Bond/Contribution.

62. **Suffolk County Council Travel Planner – Comments.** The updated copy of the Residential Travel Plan has taken into account my earlier comments. I have had a chance to review this travel plan and I can see that the majority of comments were taken into account and the document is much improved. There are a few minor issues that need further clarification before I can recommend approval.

Requests planning obligations relating to Travel Plan and Travel Plan Bond, including implementation and enforcement.

63. **Suffolk County Council Planning Obligations – Comments.** This re-consultation is as a result of amended plans submitted by the applicant. From my perspective, I have no further comments to make.

REPRESENTATIONS:

64. **Beck Row Parish Council –**

Scheme submitted with original application (July 2014)

Objects to the proposals on the grounds that it will have a negative impact on the community, for the following reasons:

- The original application (F/2003/1077/OUT) was a departure from the Development Plan and was subject to exceptional planning consent being granted, despite representations that there was no requirement for USAF housing. There remains no requirement at the present time.
- Other developments in the village have provided a full financial contribution with regard to Section 106.
- Developments already approved will bring the Parish to the point that any further large scale development such as proposed will be detrimental to our village as the infrastructure can barely cope at present.
- USAF housing around the Sycamore Drive area is shortly coming to the end of its contract and it is highly likely that these houses will be offered on the open market.
- Where will the residents of the proposed development find employment as there appears to be no opportunities for the numbers envisaged locally.
- There is no affordable housing.
- The effect of open market housing will put further pressure on Beck Row Primary School.

Amended scheme (July 2015):

Objects to the application on the following grounds:

- Road layout with heavy agricultural vehicles using the Holmsey Green junction with the A110l and houses being built so closely to the road.
- Volume of houses being built against the very limited number of jobs available, particularly with the proposed closure of RAF Mildenhall.

If this application is approved the Parish Council would like the affordable housing nominations to go to only people connected to the Parish.

If this application is approved will the Parish still receive the promised £120,000 contribution towards a new community facility as agreed in the original legal agreement?

65. **Third party representations** have been received from residents of the following properties:

- 66B The Street
- 32 Holmsey Green
- 76 The Street,
- 78 The Street
- Yappies, 6 Holmsey Green

66. The following is a summary of the issues raised:

- Building work has already started
- Impact on residential amenity:
Loss of privacy
Overlooking.
Overbearing relationship with existing properties.
Existing properties already overlooked by new development – these proposals will exacerbate existing situation.
- Visual Impact
- Design of development: small garden sizes.
- Highway Issues:
Understood that Holmsey Green would be stopped up. Why is this not happening?
Highway safety issues along Holmsey Green.
- Drainage Issues: Will the sewer be able to take more housing?
- Need for suitable boundary treatment
- Other issues:
Site unsightly.
Need more litter bins and dog waste bins.
Devaluation of existing properties.
Council should compensate if development goes ahead.
Existing properties not shown on site layout plan.
Right of way over the land has been overlooked.

POLICIES:

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

67. The Development Plan for Forest Heath comprises the following:

- The Forest Heath Local Plan (1995) as 'saved' by the Secretary of State in September 2007 and as subsequently amended by the adoption of the Forest Heath Core Strategy in May 2010, and the Joint Development Management Policies in February 2015.
- The Forest Heath Core Strategy adopted in May 2010, as amended following the High Court Order which quashed the majority of Policy CS7 and made consequential amendments to Policies CS1 and CS13.

- The adopted policies of the Joint Development Management Policies Document (JDMP) Local Plan Document (February 2015).

68. The following Development Plan policies are applicable to the application proposal:

Forest Heath Local Plan (1995) Saved Policies

Inset Map No.6 - Beck Row Development Boundary.

Forest Heath Core Strategy 2010

Visions:

- **Vision 1** – Forest Heath
- **Vision 7** – Beck Row, Exning, Kentford, West Row

Spatial Objectives:

- **H1** – Housing provision
- **H2** – Housing mix and design standard
- **H3** – Suitable housing and facilities
- **C1** – Retention and enhancement of key community facilities
- **C2** – Provision and maintenance of open space, play and sports facilities and access to the countryside
- **ENV1** – Habitats and landscapes and improving biodiversity
- **ENV2** – Climate change and reduction of carbon emissions
- **ENV3** – Promotion of renewable energy and energy efficiency
- **ENV4** – Design and architectural quality respecting local distinctiveness
- **ENV5** – Designing out crime and anti-social behaviour
- **ENV6** – Reduction of waste to landfill
- **ENV7** – Achievement of sustainable communities by ensuring services and infrastructure are commensurate with new development
- **T1** – Location of new development where there are opportunities for sustainable travel

Policies

- **CS1:** Spatial Strategy
- **CS2:** Natural Environment
- **CS3:** Landscape Character and the Historic Environment
- **CS4:** Reduce Emissions, Mitigate and Adapt to Future Climate Change.
- **CS5:** Design Quality and Local Distinctiveness
- **CS6:** Sustainable Economic Development and Tourism
- **CS7:** Overall Housing Provision (sub-paragraph 1 only. Sub paragraphs 2,3, 4 and 5 were quashed by the Court Order)
- **CS9:** Affordable Housing Provision
- **CS10:** Sustainable Rural Communities
- **CS13:** Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015

- **DM1** – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development.
- **DM2** – Creating Places – Development Principles and Local Distinctiveness.
- **DM3** – Masterplans.
- **DM4** – Development Briefs.
- **DM5** – Development in the Countryside.
- **DM6** – Flooding and Sustainable Drainage.
- **DM7** – Sustainable Design and Construction.
- **DM10** – Impact of Development on Sites of Biodiversity and Geodiversity Interest.
- **DM11** – Protected Species.
- **DM12** – Mitigation, Enhancement, Management and Monitoring of Biodiversity.
- **DM13** – Landscape Features.
- **DM14** – Protecting and Enhancing Natural Resources, Minimising Pollution and Safeguarding from Hazards.
- **DM20** – Archaeology.
- **DM22** – Residential Design.
- **DM41** – Community Facilities and Services.
- **DM42** – Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities.
- **DM44** – Rights of Way.
- **DM45** – Transport Assessments and Travel Plans.
- **DM46** – Parking Standards.

Other Planning Policy

Supplementary Planning Documents

69. The following Supplementary Planning Documents are relevant to this planning application:
- Joint Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (October 2013)
 - Open Space, Sport and Recreation Supplementary Planning Document (October 2011)

Emerging Development Plan Policy

70. **Single Issues Review and Site Allocations Development Plan Document:** The Core Strategy Single Issue Review (SIR) Local Plan Document reached the Issues and Options stage in July 2012. An 8 week consultation was undertaken. The proposed submission draft document was approved for consultation in early 2014. The consultation was subsequently postponed to enable further SA and SEA work.
71. Members subsequently resolved to prepare the Core Strategy SIR in tandem with the Site Specifics Allocations Document. A joint consultation commenced on 11 August 2015 and will run for 8 weeks. Adoption is anticipated by the end of 2017.
72. For the site document this is the very first stage in the plan process 'Issues and Options' and includes all potential sites - many of which will not be taken forward to the next stage.

73. At the present time, the Single Issue Review and the Site Specific Allocations Document therefore carry limited weight in the decision making process, although the published evidence underlying the SIR still has weight.

National Planning Policy and Guidance

74. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a material consideration for planning decisions and is relevant to the consideration of this application.

75. Paragraph 14 of the NPPF identifies the principle objective of the Framework:

'At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking. For decision taking this means:

- *Approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and*
- *Where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies out-of-date, granting permission unless:*

-any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this framework taken as a whole;

- *Or specific policies in this framework indicate development should be restricted'.*

76. This presumption in favour of sustainable development is further reinforced by advice within the Framework relating to decision-taking. Paragraph 186 requires Local Planning Authorities to *'approach decision taking in a positive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development'*. Paragraph 187 states that Local Planning Authorities *'should look for solutions rather than problems, and decision takers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible'*.

77. The relevant parts of the NPPF are discussed below in the officer comment section of this report.

78. The Government published its National Planning Practice Guidance in March 2014 following a comprehensive exercise to view and consolidate all existing planning guidance into one accessible, web-based resource. The guidance assists with interpretation about various planning issues, and advises on best practice and planning process. Relevant parts of the NPPF are discussed below in the officer comment section of this report.

79. Paragraph 215 of the NPPF states that due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans 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).

80. Paragraph 14 of the NPPF states that where the Development Plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, development proposals should be determined in accordance with the relevant test - that is whether *'any adverse impacts...would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole'*.

PLANNING EVALUATION

81. The Planning Statement submitted in support of this planning application makes a case for supporting the principle of the development of the site - given that the site benefits from an existing planning permission for 150 dwellings. The planning history is important, and ultimately determinative, with respect to the principle of residential development.
82. Outline planning permission for the residential development of this site was granted in 2005. Planning permission was granted as a departure from the development plan, on the basis of need by the USAF. A reserved matters application was subsequently approved in 2008.
83. The 2005 planning permission has since been implemented. The Council is satisfied that the scheme has legally commenced. The planning permission for 150 dwellings has therefore been saved and can be lawfully completed. The occupancy restriction means that the dwellings can only be inhabited by USAF personnel.
84. In planning terms, the site is now afforded a 'residential' use, irrespective of the occupancy restriction. The residential development of this site for 166 dwellings, as an alternative to the scheme originally approved in 2008, must therefore be considered acceptable in principle.
85. In assessing the acceptability of the current planning application, the key material considerations relate to the details of the development - in the light of any material changes in circumstances since the application was granted planning permission. The development which has previously been approved acts as a key material consideration in this respect. Members are reminded that the extant planning permission was for 150 restricted occupancy dwellings, for members of the US Air Force only. This application seeks planning permission for 166 market houses, including 49 affordable units.
86. The subsequent section of the report considers the material changes in circumstances and other relevant material planning considerations, (including site specific considerations and Section 106 requirements) before concluding by balancing the benefit of the development proposals against the dis-benefits.

Principle of Development

National Policy Context

87. Paragraph 47 of the Frameworks states that to boost significantly the supply of housing, local planning authorities should use their evidence base to ensure that

their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area (as far as is consistent with policy), including identifying key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period.

88. In addition, the Framework requires authorities to identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites, sufficient to provide five-years worth of housing against their housing requirements, with an additional buffer of 5% (or a 20% buffer if there is evidence of a persistent under delivery of new housing) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land.
89. The latest assessment of the District's five year supply of housing land was published in February 2015. This confirms that the Council is able to demonstrate a five-year supply of housing.
90. In terms of housing provision in the District, the saved settlement boundary plans are out of date, pre-dating the NPPF by some time. All of the sites allocated within the 1995 Local Plan have either been built out or are considered undeliverable. On this basis, and in accordance with the advice offered in the NPPF, the saved settlement boundary plans are considered to carry limited weight.
91. In such circumstances, planning applications for new housing development fall to be considered against the provisions of the NPPF and any Development Plan policies which do not relate to the supply of housing. The Framework places a strong presumption in favour of sustainable development, and where Development Plans are out of date, advises in Paragraph 14 that planning permission should be granted unless *'any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole...'*
92. The NPPF does not equate to a blanket approval for residential development in locations that would otherwise conflict with Local Plan policies. If the adverse impacts of the proposals significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, then planning permission should still be refused. The fundamental planning principle is that each case must be considered on its own merits.

Development Plan Policy Context

93. Beck Row is designated as a Primary Village within the Forest Heath Core Strategy (Policy CS1). Under this policy, limited housing growth to meet housing needs is generally supported in principle.
94. The development is included in the Council's five year land supply as a site identified in SHLAA that is considered deliverable with the 5 year land supply. The development of the site for 166 residential units is acceptable in principle.
95. The majority of the application site is situated outside of the settlement boundary for Beck Row, on land which was previously greenfield. The 2004 planning permission means that the site is now afforded a 'residential' use: the previous status as a greenfield site has been lost.

96. In addition, the saved settlement boundary plans contained in the 1995 Local Plan are based on housing provision as contained in the 1991 Suffolk Structure Plan, which has since been abolished. On the basis of advice offered in the NPPF, officers consider that the saved settlement boundary plan for Beck Row currently carries limited weight.

Environmental Capacity

97. The Council’s Planning Policy Officer, in consultation correspondence, confirms that the ‘original’ growth strategy in respect of the District’s settlement hierarchy was found to be sound. This would suggest that Beck Row has the environmental capacity to deliver the 166 dwellings proposed by this planning application.
98. In terms of the potential environmental capacity of infrastructure in Beck Row, it has been held at planning appeal that the 2009 Infrastructure and Environmental Capacity Assessment (‘IECA report’) represents the best available evidence.
99. The IECA report considers the environmental capacity of settlements in the District, and recognises the need for a mechanism to provide social, physical and environmental infrastructure to support growth. The report also considers settlement infrastructure tipping points which are utilised to evaluate potential impacts on infrastructure.
100. The IECA report identifies a range of capacity in Beck Row of some 240-420 new dwellings in the plan period to 2031 (although this would be subject to significant infrastructure improvements in line with growth). Moreover, the extant permission for 150 dwellings would not have been included as part of the IECA capacity assessment, being an existing commitment pre-dating the report.
101. The IECA report suggests that there is environmental capacity to facilitate not only the dwellings that are proposed by this planning application, but also other major residential developments in Beck Row that the planning authority has already permitted. In combination, these represent up to 399 additional residential units.

TABLE 2: Beck Row - Total number of residential units

PLANNING REFERENCE	SITE LOCATION	PLANNING STATUS	NUMBER OF DWELLINGS
DC/13/0123/OUT	Land at Aspal Lane	Planning permission granted June 2015.	Up to 117 dwellings
DC/14/1745/OUT	Beck Lodge Farm	Resolution to approve subject to S106 (July 2015).	Up to 24 dwellings
DC/15/0922/OUT	Adjacent 1 St	Resolution to	Up to 60 dwellings

	John's Street	approve subject to S106 (Sept 2015).	
DC/13/0144/FUL	Scrap Yard Site, Skelton's Drove	Planning permission granted June 2015.	Up to 32 mobile homes
DC/14/1206/FUL	Land at Skelton's Drove	Current planning application.	166 dwellings
TOTAL NUMBER OF RESIDENTIAL UNITS			399 UNITS

102. Officers acknowledge that the IECA report has been held at planning appeal to contain the most up-to-date information relating to infrastructure and capacity in the District. However, given that the IECA report was written approximately 5 years ago, officers are of the opinion that it can no longer be considered an accurate reflection of infrastructure provision within settlements. In the context of the subject planning application, officers have evaluated the IECA evidence against the advice contained in consultation responses received. This is considered in further detail in the Cumulative Impacts section below.

Prematurity

103. Guidance on prematurity is not addressed directly by the Framework. However, more recent advice about the approach the decision maker should take is set out in the National Planning Practice Guide (NPPG) which was published in March 2014. This states that refusal of planning permission on grounds of prematurity will seldom be justified where a draft Local Plan has yet to be submitted for examination, or in the case of a Neighbourhood Plan, before the end of the local planning authority publicity period. Where planning permission is refused on grounds of prematurity, the local planning authority will need to indicate clearly how the grant of permission for the development concerned would prejudice the outcome of the plan-making process.
104. Given the planning history of this site, approval of this application would not prejudice the proper consideration of site options for development in Beck Row. The development proposal cannot therefore be considered premature in the context of the emerging Single Issue Review and Site Specific Allocations Document.
105. In assessing whether a development proposal is premature, the cumulative impacts in combination with other committed development is also an important consideration. Officers acknowledge that each settlement has its own unique characteristic (for example, infrastructure 'tipping points') that govern its ability to accommodate growth and at what stage.
106. The cumulative scale of development on these sites amounts to 399 dwellings. Officers do not consider the cumulative scale of residential development proposed in Beck Row to be substantial in comparison to the overall quantum of development to be provided across the District, over the Plan period.

107. Given the context of the current guidance as outlined above, officers consider that it would be difficult to justify any decision that approval of this scheme would be premature.
108. On the basis of national guidance on the issue of prematurity, and relevant national policies providing for the delivery of sustainable development without delay, Officers do not consider it would be reasonable to object to the planning application on the grounds of it being premature to the Development Plan.
109. Notwithstanding that the Council now has a five year land supply in place, officers consider that Paragraph 215 of the NPPF (which states that the weight that can be given to a plan is dependent on the degree of consistency with the Framework) and Paragraph 14 of the NPPF are of relevance, in that:
- The provision of housing as set out in the saved local plan maps contained within the 1995 Forest Heath Local Plan are based on housing provision contained in the since abolished Suffolk Structure Plan. This pre dates the NPPF and is out of date. Little or no weight can therefore be attributed.
 - The Core Strategy is up to date in terms of its settlement strategy which focuses development in the market towns. The quashing of the majority of Policy CS7 and consequential amendments to Policies CS1 and CS13 means that it is silent on housing distribution within the District.
 - The new Local Plan will address these issues. It is currently on consultation at Issues and Options stage. It is therefore absent.
110. Given that the Development Plan is *'absent; silent or relevant policies are out of date'* the Council's approach, based on Paragraph 14 of the NPPF, is therefore to determine whether the development proposal is sustainable development by reference to the relevant test in Paragraph 14 – that is, whether *'any adverse impacts....would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole'*.
111. A key determining factor will be whether the proposed development can be deemed 'sustainable' in the context of the policies contained in the Framework (as a whole). Even if it is concluded that the proposals would not be 'unsustainable' following analysis, further consideration must be given to whether the benefits of development outweigh its dis-benefits, as required by the Framework.
112. A balancing exercise is carried out towards the end of this section of the report as part of concluding comments. An officer evaluation to assist with Members consideration of whether the development proposed by this planning application is 'sustainable development' is set out below on an issue by issue basis.

Sustainable Transport/Impact upon the Highway Network

113. National planning policy in relation to the transport planning of developments is set out in the Framework. Section 4, paragraphs 29 to 41 deal specifically with transport planning and the promotion of sustainable transport.

114. The Framework confirms that the transport system needs to be balanced in favour of sustainable transport modes, giving people a real choice about how they travel. Paragraph 32 of the Framework requires all developments that generate significant amounts of movements to be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. It goes on to advise that development should not be prevented or refused on transport grounds, unless the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.
115. Paragraph 34 of the Framework states that planning decisions should ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable modes of transport can be maximised. However the Framework recognises that different policies and measures will be required in different communities, and opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary from urban to rural areas.
116. Core Strategy Spatial Policy T1 aims to ensure that new development is located where there are the best opportunities for sustainable travel and the least dependency on car travel. This is reflected in Policies CS12 and CS13 which confirms the District Council will work with the partners (including developers) to secure necessary transport infrastructure and sustainable transport measures, and ensure that access and safety concerns are resolved in all developments.
117. Policy DM2 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document requires that new development should produce designs that accord with standards and maintain or enhance the safety of the highway network. Policy DM45 sets out criteria for the submission of Transport Assessments and Travel Plans to accompany planning applications, whilst Policy DM26 addresses parking standards.
118. In the specific context of Beck Row, the IECA report recognizes that the local transport network as a potential constraining factor to development.

Access Arrangements

119. In terms of the proposed access arrangements, the site to the west of Skelton's Drove will link through to existing residential development. The existing accesses connect to The Street (A1101) to the west of the application site.
120. The application site to the east of Skelton's Drove would be accessed via an existing roundabout onto The Street. Holmsey Green is shown as being diverted through the new development. The new access road will pass through part of the site to join Holmsey Green, with a new revised priority junction proposed.
121. Holmsey Green is subject to a 30mph speed limit, and connects to The Street (A1101) at a junction approximately 55 metres west of the proposed priority junction.
122. Suffolk County Council as highway authority has no objection to the proposed access arrangements. Details of the estate roads and footpaths can be secured by planning condition. In addition, it will be important to ensure that adequate provision is made for refuse bin storage and collection. A condition has been recommended to ensure that this aspect of the layout is acceptable.

Stopping up of Holmsey Green

123. The outline planning permission granted under planning reference F/2003/1077/OUT also approved the detailed arrangement of a proposed new T Junction off The Street, and the closure of the existing Holmsey Green/The Street junction. The current planning application proposes a revised access configuration. It is no longer the intention to stop up Holmsey Green/The Street.
124. The Parish Council and third party representations raise concern regarding the proposed reconfigured priority arrangement onto Holmsey Green. Concern has also been raised that the Holmsey Green/The Street junction will no longer be stopped up.
125. The current application proposes that access to Holmsey Green from The Street/A1101 will be retained for the businesses and new residential accesses which front the existing section of Holmsey Green. It is no longer the intention that this junction will be stopped up.
126. Further advice on this matter has been sought from Suffolk County Council as Highway Authority. In correspondence received on 08 September 2015, the County Highways Engineer confirmed that (following a road safety audit and significant amount of work by the designer and Development Management Engineer), the final design removed the stopping up of Holmsey Green for the following reasons:
 - Delivery, refuse and other large vehicles would have difficulty turning around in the stopped up road, as it would effectively be a 'dead end' without the benefit of a turning head. This would have been detrimental to highway safety.
 - The proposed development provides an improved link from The Street to Holmsey Green, via the roundabout immediately to the west of the existing junction. The existing route is effectively being 'by passed' with a route more suitable for increased traffic flows.
127. The Highways Engineer envisages that through traffic and those accessing the proposed development will use the new, reconfigured, route - rather than the existing junction and southern end of Holmsey Green. It is the view of the Highway Authority that once residents are familiar with the new route, this will result in a significant reduction in use of the existing junction.
128. Officers appreciate the concerns raised locally regarding the new access arrangements. Suffolk County Council, as Highway Authority, is satisfied that the proposal will not have a significant adverse impact on highway safety. Moreover, detailed highways advice which clarifies why the proposed access arrangements are acceptable in highways terms. On the basis of the advice received, it would be unreasonable to refuse the application on these grounds.

Car Parking

129. During the course of the application, the site layout was revised to address concerns raised by the Highway Engineer in respect of car parking. The revised scheme provides a total of 356 car parking spaces. An accompanying Parking Schedule confirms that this level of provision is in accordance with the adopted parking standards (the Suffolk Guidance for Parking 2014).
130. Car parking is allocated to each dwelling, and is predominantly on or close to the residential unit to which it relates. A communal car parking area is also provided on the eastern side of the site. Officers appreciate that such a configuration is not always popular, and can lead to demand for on-street parking. Its presence within the scheme cannot justify a refusal of planning permission on these grounds.
131. Parking details can be secured by way of planning condition, in accordance with the consultation advice offered on behalf of the Highway Authority.

Trip Generation

132. The Transport Statement which accompanies the planning application sets out the likely traffic volumes generated by the proposed development. This identifies an additional 110 2-way trips in the AM peak hour, and 125 2-way trips in the PM peak hour. Overall, a daily total number of 980 vehicle trips are predicted. In addition, a trip distribution model has been scaled by an appropriate growth factor over five years. This predicts a slight increase in the total number of trips over this period.
133. Suffolk County Council as Highway Authority has raised no objection to the development proposals in terms of the proposed trip generation. On this basis, officers consider that the development could be accommodated on the existing highway network without a significant material increase in traffic on the local road network.

Sustainable Transport

134. During the course of the application, a revised Travel Plan was submitted in respect to consultation advice from Suffolk County Council. The detail of this document can be secured as part of the planning obligation process, in accordance with the advice received

Connectivity

135. Skelton's Drove is a private roadway with no public rights of access and no pavements. The two parts of the application remain separate, and the application proposes no rights of access across Skelton's Drove. This is consistent with the extant planning permission.
136. Access over Skelton's Drove was resisted by the previous landowner, Defence Estates. Officers are aware that landownership of the Drove has changed in recent months. The applicant has been asked to consider the provision of an easement (or agreed permanent right of access) across the Drove, to enable pedestrian and cycle access between the two halves of the development. Pedestrian and cycle access across the Drove would aid permeability across the site, and improve connectivity with existing shops and services.

137. Whilst the presence of a link across Skelton's Drove is desirable in terms of site permeability, it is not essential. The layout does allow for future access to and across the Drove, should the situation change.

Summary

138. The Framework directs that applications should only be refused on transport grounds if the residential cumulative impacts of the development are severe. Officers are satisfied that the proposed development can be accommodated in highways terms, and will bring about local transport improvements which can be secured through the Section 106 process. In movement terms, the application is considered to be acceptable. In reaching this decision, it is material that that the County Highways Engineer has raised no objection to the proposals.

Flood Risk, Drainage and Pollution

139. 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.
140. The Framework also offers advice in respect of pollution and land instability, and states that planning decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location. It also confirms that, where a site is affected by contamination or land stability issues, responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/or landowner.
141. Core Strategy Policy CS4 states the Council will support development proposals that avoid areas of current and future flood risk and which do not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. The policy confirms sites for new development will be allocated in locations with the lowest risk of flooding (Environment Agency Zone 1 flood category) and will seek the implementation of Sustainable Urban Drainage Schemes (SUDS) into all new development proposals, where technically feasible.
142. Policy DM6 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document sets out surface water information requirements for planning applications. DM14 addresses proposals for sites which are or are suspected to be *inter alia*, contaminated.

Flood Risk/Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)

143. The application site lies within Flood Zone 1 on the Environment Agency Flood Risk maps, representing an area at low risk of flooding and suitable for all forms of development.
144. The application documentation includes a Flood Risk and Foul and Storm Water Drainage Assessment. The report concludes that the development of the site would not pose an unacceptable flood risk either to occupants of the site or to land off site.

145. The scheme layout does not make any provision for SuDS. The applicant has confirmed that surface water will be attenuated via a series of private and highways soakaways. Such measures may include the installation of drainage crates between open space areas.
146. It will be important to ensure that the detailed landscape design (including tree planting), and useable play space is not compromised by the requirements of surface water drainage infrastructure. Resolution of the management of the soakaways can be addressed by means of a suitably worded condition.

Foul Drainage

147. The application site is located in an area which is served by the public foul sewer. Foul drainage from the development is in the catchment of Mildenhall Water Recycling Centre. Anglian Water, in consultation correspondence, has confirmed that there is available capacity to treat the flows from the proposed site.
148. The Flood Risk and Foul and Storm Water Drainage Assessment which accompanies the application advises that there are existing public sewers in The Street, Holmsey Green and in adjacent development in to which connections were designed and approved by Anglian Water for the previous development.
149. The Flood Risk Assessment states advises that it may be necessary to provide a small private pumping facility for a small number of dwellings, although acknowledges that slightly raising floor and road levels in the area will avoid this situation. The final details of the drainage strategy, including finished floor levels, will be secured by planning condition.

Contamination

150. A site investigation report was submitted as part of the application proposals. In accordance with the advice offered by the Council's Environment Officer, a condition in respect of the reporting of unexpected contamination can be secured should planning approval be forthcoming.

Summary

151. The Environment Agency, Anglian Water Services, Suffolk County Council and the Council's Environmental Health team have not objected to or raised concerns about the application proposals in respect of flood risk, drainage and pollution. All have recommended the imposition of reasonable conditions upon any potential planning permission to secure appropriate mitigation. On this basis, the proposals are considered acceptable with regard to flood risk, surface water/foul drainage, potable water supply, SuDS and ground contamination.

Impact upon Landscape

152. The Framework confirms the planning system should *inter alia* protect and enhance 'valued landscapes' and promotes development of previously used land, other than continuing the protection of formal Greenbelt designations (of which there are none in the District) and recognising the hierarchy of graded

agricultural land. National policy stops short of seeking to protect the 'countryside' from new development in a general sense.

153. Core Strategy Policies CS2 and CS3 seek to protect, conserve and (where possible) enhance the quality, character and local distinctiveness of the landscape, and refer to the Forest Heath Landscape Character Assessment to inform detailed assessment of individual proposals.
154. The application site is undeveloped land which adjoins the existing built up area of Beck Row. The site is visible from a number of public viewpoints along Holmsey Green and Skelton's Drove. The site contains a number of boundary trees.
155. The residential development of this parcel of land is not considered to be out of context, given its relationship with existing residential development. It is acknowledged that the landscape character will change irreversibly in the long term as a result of the development proposals. The extent of the visual impact of the proposed development on the landscape is considered acceptable given the context.

Summary

156. Officers have considered the submitted documentation, and visited the application site and surrounding area. Whilst the proposals would irreversibly change the character of the immediate locality, the wider impact of the development proposals upon landscape quality and character are considered to be acceptable.

Impact upon the Natural Environment

157. The Framework confirms the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural environment by inter alia minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains where possible. The Framework states that protection of designated sites should be commensurate with the status of the site, recognising the hierarchy of international, national and local designations. The presumption in favour of sustainable development set out at Paragraph 14 of the Framework does not apply where development requires appropriate assessment under the Birds or Habitats Directives.
158. Spatial Objective ENV1 of the Core Strategy aims to conserve and enhance the habitats and landscapes of international, national and local importance and improve the rich biodiversity of the District. This objective forms the basis of Core Strategy Policy CS2 which sets out in greater detail how this objective will be implemented. Saved Local Plan Policy 4.15 sets out criteria against which proposals for new housing development are considered. One of the criteria requires that such proposals are not detrimental to significant nature conservation interests.
159. There are no designated sites on or immediately adjacent to the application site. However the site is situated within close proximity to the Wilde Street Meadow Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).

Habitats Regulations Assessment

160. The local planning authority, as the competent authority, is responsible for the Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) as required by The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended). The Ecological Survey which was submitted in support of the planning application advises that given the distance from internationally protected sites, the proposed development would have no direct effect on the interest features of these sites. Natural England, in consultation correspondence, has advised that the proposed development is not likely to have significant effects on the interest features for which Wilde Street Meadow SSSI has been designated.
161. The HRA screening process was undertaken by the Council's Ecology, Tree and Landscape Officer, as part of the consultation response. This confirms that the proposal will not have a likely significant effect on any European site, and can therefore be screened out from any requirement for further assessment.

Ecology

162. An Ecological Survey including a Phase 1 Habitat survey of the site and protected species surveys has been submitted in support of the planning application. The Survey identifies that a significant population of common lizards were found, and a low population of grass snakes. Mitigation is proposed to prevent harm during site clearance works, through translocation to a receptor site.
163. Additional information was submitted during the course of the application, in relation to the reptile receptor site. The Council's Ecology, Tree and Landscape Officer has confirmed the acceptability of this information, subject of details of the mitigation being secured by planning condition.
164. The recommendations of the Ecological Survey include ecological enhancements. These can be secured by way of planning condition.

Trees

165. The application site contains a number of trees within the site boundaries, none of which are subject to Tree Preservation Orders (TPO's).
166. A Tree Survey Schedule and Tree Constraints Plan were submitted as part of the application documentation. Subject to planning conditions to ensure appropriate tree planting as part of a landscaping scheme, the application raises no arboricultural issues.

Summary

167. Subject to the implementation in full of recommended mitigation and enhancement measures (which can be secured through relevant planning conditions), the proposed development is considered to satisfactorily address ecological issues.
168. On the basis of the above evaluation, officers are of the opinion that the development proposals would not have an unacceptable impact on the nature conservation value of the application site.

Impact upon the Historic Environment

169. The Framework recognises that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource which should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. When considering the impact of proposed development upon the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The term 'heritage asset' used in the Framework includes designated assets such as Listed Buildings, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens and Conservation Areas, and also various undesignated assets including archaeological sites and unlisted buildings which are of local interest.
170. The Framework advises that local planning authority's should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, the level of detail being proportionate to the importance of the asset and sufficient to understand the potential impact upon their significance. Core Strategy Spatial Objective aims to protect and enhance the Historic Environment. This objective is implemented through Policy CS3.

Archaeology

171. Suffolk County Council has been consulted in respect of the development proposals. The County Archaeological Officer has confirmed that the development area has been fully evaluated, and the area of significant archeological deposit has been excavated. A commitment on completing the analysis and reporting on the excavation has also been made by the development. On this basis, there is no need for an archaeological condition.
172. On this basis of the statutory advice offered, the development proposals accord with Core Strategy Policy CS3 and the advice offered in the Framework with regard to the conservation of heritage assets of archaeological interest.

Summary

173. Officers have considered the application proposals in the context of the impact on the historic environment. Subject to the recommendation of appropriate archaeological conditions as described above, the proposal would not cause significant harm to the historic environment.

Design of the Built Environment

174. The Framework states the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment and confirms good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and is indivisible from good planning. The Framework goes on to reinforce these statements by confirming that planning permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.
175. Core Strategy Spatial Objective H2 aims to provide a sufficient and appropriate mix of housing that is designed to a high standard. Design aspirations are also included in Spatial Objectives ENV4 (high standard of design) and ENV5

(community safety and crime reduction through design. The Objectives are supported by Policies CS5 and CS13 which require high quality designs which reinforce local distinctiveness and take account of the need for stronger and safer communities. Policy CS5 confirms design that does not demonstrate it has had regard to local context and fails to enhance character will not be acceptable.

176. Policy DM2 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document sets out the design aspirations and requirements the Council expects should be provided by developments. Policy DM13 requires *inter alia*, the submission of landscaping schemes with development proposals, where appropriate. Policy DM22 sets out detailed design criteria for considering new residential proposals.
177. This planning application is a full application, with all details included for consideration. Consultation advice was received from the Council's Ecology, Tree and Landscape Officer, and the Police Architectural Liaison Officer during the course of the application. This informed revisions to the design and layout of the scheme.

Layout and Design

178. The evaluation of the proposal on design matters is very much a matter of judgement and balance. The general design of the scheme, in terms of the road hierarchy, location of open space and density changes (for example along boundaries with existing development and the countryside, and facing the open space) is considered to be well designed, and would provide a positive sense of place for future residents.
179. In terms of the detailed design, the scheme includes a variety of building styles and types, publically accessible open space and adequate private amenity space would all contribute to the quality of the environment.

Connectivity

180. An identified inefficiency of the scheme layout is the lack of access across Skelton's Drove. Skelton's Drove is not in the control of the applicant, and was owned by the Ministry of Defence until recently. In terms of good layout planning and encouraging sustainable methods of moving through the site, the lack of access across the Drove is regrettable.
181. The provision of cycle and pedestrian links across Skelton's Drove would connect the two land parcels, and aid permeability through the site. The layout does allow for future access to and across the Drove, should the situation change. In movement terms the application is considered to be acceptable despite this connection.

External Materials

182. The proposed materials would be appropriate to the location, and are typical of what would be expected to find on a new residential development. The detail of the proposed dwellings is also influenced by the Suffolk vernacular. The materials palette is considered acceptable, and will help to ensure that a good quality housing area is developed in reality.

Cycle and bin storage provision

183. All properties have access to private rear amenity spaces such that bins and cycles could be stored away from the public realm. A strategy for bin and cycle storage for the occupiers is sought by the Highways Engineer, and can be secured by planning condition.

Boundary treatment

184. The site is open to the north and it will be important to ensure that good screening is secured. The detail of this aspect of the scheme can be ensured through planning conditions.

Design and Crime

185. The Crime and Disorder Act 1988 places a duty on the local authority to do all that it can reasonably do to prevent crime and disorder in its area. Paragraph 58 of the NPPF states that ' Crime Pattern Analysis for the area shows that over the past 3 years there has been significant increases in public order offences, whilst vehicle crime and burglary figures have remained stable.
186. The Architectural Liaison Officer for Suffolk Police provided comments in respect of the design of the original scheme and subsequently met the planning case officer. The layout was reviewed with a view to designing out the areas which may become crime generators in the future. This included consideration of natural surveillance, and reduction of permeability.
187. Revisions to the scheme layout include limiting the number of rear access footpaths to housing (which allow permeability). Natural surveillance has also been increased for car parking areas and areas of open space. Planning conditions can secure the detail of the development, to ensure that vehicular access is prevented onto public space.

Conclusion

188. Amendments to the scheme during the course of the application have resulted in positive improvements to the design and layout of the development. The relatively hard, urban character of the housing area would be balanced by the provision of on-site public open space and strong boundary treatment. The development scheme would be as connected to adjoining development as it could be. Planning conditions can be secured to ensure specific details of the development would contribute positively to the character of the development.
189. After considering the elements which contribute to the character of the development, it is concluded that the scheme is acceptable in terms of design. Officers consider that the scheme presents a positive opportunity for a high quality living environment with well designed modern homes.

Impact Upon Residential Amenity

190. The protection of residential amenity is a key component of 'good design'. The Framework also states, as part of its design policies, that good planning should positively contribute to making places better for people.

191. Vision 1 of the Core Strategy seeks to provide a 'higher quality of life' for residents. Policy DM2 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document seeks to safeguard *inter alia*, residential amenity from potentially adverse effects of new development.

Impact On Residential Amenity

192. The application site is situated immediately adjacent existing residential development. Properties which front The Street, and properties in Shrubhouse Close have rear gardens which abut the common boundaries of the application site.
193. The degree of separation between existing residential properties and the proposed dwellings is considered acceptable. The development is not considered to cause harm to existing residential amenity in terms of potential overlooking, dominance or loss of light such as to warrant its refusal on these grounds. Planning conditions can be secured relation to the hours of construction.
194. Third party representations have raised specific concerns regarding the impact of the development proposals on existing residential amenity. With regard to Nos. 76 and 78 The Street, Locks Lane, officers appreciate that new residential properties will abut the common boundaries of these properties. This relationship is considered acceptable, and not unusual in the context of new development.
195. The third party correspondence received from the occupants of Nos. 76 and 78 draw attention to the recent residential development of the Smoke House Inn site to the west. Whilst officers note the concerns raised, this application proposals are not considered to cause such harm to the existing residential amenity of the occupants of these properties, such as to warrant the refusal on these grounds.
196. Third party representations in respect of impact on residential amenity have also been received from the occupants of Nos 66 B The Street, which is a bungalow. The layout was revised during the course of the development, and the proposed dwellings closest to this property have been re-arranged. Officers are satisfied that whilst houses are proposed, the impacts on this property in terms of overlooking would not be such as to warrant the refusal of the application on these grounds.

Summary

197. On the basis of the above evaluation, officers are satisfied that the residential amenity of the occupants of existing dwellings will not be compromised by what is proposed.

Impact upon Local Infrastructure (Utilities)

198. The 'economic' dimension of the definition of sustainable development set out in the Framework confirms the planning system should *inter alia* identify and co-ordinate development requirements, including infrastructure. Furthermore, one of the core planning principles set out in the document states that planning

should 'proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs'.

199. Core Strategy Policy CS13 sets out infrastructure requirements and developer contributions. The policy opens with the following statement:

'The release of land for development will be dependent on there being sufficient capacity in the existing local infrastructure to meet the additional requirements arising from new development'.

200. Policy CS13 lists the main areas as health and social care facilities, educational requirements, strategic transport improvements, waste water treatment capacity, energy supply (electricity), access and safety, open space, sport and recreation. The policy confirms arrangements for the provision or improvement of infrastructure will be secured by planning obligation or (where appropriate) conditions attached to planning permission to ensure infrastructure is provided at the appropriate time). It concludes that all development will be accompanied by appropriate infrastructure to meet site specific requirements and create sustainable communities.
201. Matters relating to highways, education, health and open space infrastructure are addressed later in this report when potential planning obligations are discussed. This particular section assesses the impact of the proposals upon utilities infrastructure.

Waste Water Treatment

202. The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) which accompanies the planning application advises that foul flows from the development will be connected to the Anglian Water public sewer network. Anglian Water has confirmed that there is capacity within Mildenhall Water Recycling Centre to cater for flows from the development.

Summary

203. On the basis of the available evidence, the development proposal is considered acceptable with regard to impact on infrastructure (utilities).

Sustainable Construction and Operation

204. Section 19 (1A) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires local planning authorities to include in their Local Plans 'policies designed to secure that the development and use of land in the local planning authority's area contribute to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change'.
205. The NPPF confirms planning has a key role in helping shape and secure radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions whilst supporting the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy. The Government places this central to the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development. The document expands on this role with the following advice:
206. In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should expect new development to:

- Comply with adopted Local Plan policies on local requirements for de-centralised energy supply unless it can be demonstrated by the applicant, having regard to the type of development involved and its design, that this is not feasible or viable; and
 - Take account of landform, layout, building orientation, massing and landscaping to minimise energy consumption
207. The importance the Government places on addressing climate change is reflected in the Core Strategy Visions (Vision 1) and Spatial Objectives (ENV2 and ENV3). Core Strategy Policies CS4 and CS5 set out the requirement for sustainable construction methods, and a range of expectations of new sites.
208. A Sustainability Statement was submitted with the application. This demonstrates how the development will be designed and constructed in a sustainable manner. This includes the selection of sustainable materials, control of pollution during construction, the management of waste and recycling and the reduction of water usage.
209. Waste arising from the construction process will be managed in accordance with a Site Waste Management Plan. This can be secured by way of planning condition.
210. On the basis of the above evaluation, officers are satisfied that the proposal is generally acceptable in terms of sustainable construction and operation.
211. Waste – The re-use and recycling of materials during construction can be secured by planning condition.
212. Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs) –The documentation submitted with the application confirms that SuDS will be used on site. This can be conditioned.

Cumulative Impacts

213. Members will be aware that there have been a number of major planning applications for residential development in Beck Row in the last 18 months (Table 2). Most recently, at the July and September 2015 meeting of Development Control Committee, Members resolved to approve up to 84 units on land at Beck Lodge Farm and adjacent 1 St John's Street (subject to completion of Section 106 agreement). When combined with the 166 units proposed by this application, these schemes will total up to 399 residential units.
214. The evidence base behind the Development Plan documents will assess potential cumulative impacts of any formal site allocations. No such assessments have been carried out with regard to the potential cumulative impacts of 'developer led' planning applications.
215. This sub-section of the officer assessment considers potential cumulative impacts upon village infrastructure of the current planning application, and the previously approved schemes as identified in Table 2.

Primary Education

216. Suffolk County Council as the Local Education Authority has forecast that the development proposals will generate 41 primary age children, once all dwellings have been built and occupied. The planning applications which have previously been approved would provide an additional 233 dwellings, which would generate additional children of primary school age.
217. Suffolk County Council has sought a revised capital contribution of approximately £0.5 million for the additional school children forecast to arise from this planning application. This would be spent on enhancing existing local provision.
218. It is understood that the existing catchment primary school (Beck Row Primary School) has reached capacity. By the time the construction of these developments is underway (if all are granted and commence early), this school will have filled its pupil place capacity, and there will be no surplus places available.
219. Suffolk County Council has advised that with latent population growth and housing growth planned at Beck Row, the favoured strategy is the relocation of the community centre. This would then allow extension of Beck Row Primary School. The 'fall-back' education strategy would be to deliver a new 210 place primary school. It is anticipated that the identification of a site location will emerge via the ongoing Single Issue Review process.
220. Officers have asked Suffolk County Council for an update regarding education provision in Beck Row. As at 14 September 2015, it is understood that project plans have been agreed by the school and the community association, for the relocation of the community centre. The County Council is proceeding with detailed plans for the initial phase extension of the primary school, for September 2016. Furthermore, confirmation has been received that developer contributions secured from this planning application will be used to help fund the further expansion of the school.
221. The application proposals would provide funding to mitigate the impacts of the development on primary school provision, in accordance with the consultation advice offered on behalf of Suffolk County Council. Accordingly, the applicants have done all they can do (and that they have been asked to do), to mitigate the impact of their developments upon primary school provision.

Highways

222. The Local Highway Authority has raised no objection to any of the individual planning applications, subject to the imposition of planning conditions as referred to in the relevant section above.
223. The Parish Council has raised concerns regarding the highway impacts of the development proposals upon Beck Row. The third party concerns raised are not supported by evidence, or a considered analysis of the nature of the possible impacts. In this context, Members are reminded that the Framework advises that new development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds, if the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.

224. Officers are satisfied that the application proposals would mitigate the impacts of the development on the highways network, by way of both planning conditions and developer contributions, which can be secured through the Section 106 process. Accordingly, the applications will mitigate the impact of the development upon the highways network.

Healthcare

225. NHS healthcare services in the Beck Row area is organised by the West Suffolk Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG). The IECA report identified that Beck Row could support a 2 GP surgery.
226. In terms of existing GP facilities in the Beck Row area, it is understood that Beck Row is currently served by two GP practices in Mildenhall. Furthermore, Market Cross Surgery has capacity to serve the increased population arising from the development scheme. This would imply that there is capacity in existing GP provision to accommodate not only the residents arising from the proposed development, but the cumulative number of residents arising from other residential development schemes in Beck Row.

Open Space

227. All of the development schemes incorporate provision for open space – both in terms of on-site provision, and contributions in respect of off-site provision (secured through the Section 106 process). In this regard, the proposals are considered in accordance with Council's Supplementary Planning Document in respect of Open Space.

Landscape

228. Given the locations of the three housing development schemes around Beck Row, no cumulative landscape impacts are anticipated.

Utilities

229. Anglian Water Services did not object raise objection to the development proposals, and has confirmed that there is adequate capacity within the system to accommodate the increased flows arising from the development proposal. Officers are satisfied that the development proposals would not have adverse cumulative impacts upon the sewerage systems serving Beck Row.
230. There is no evidence to suggest that there would be significant cumulative impacts upon water and energy (electricity) supplies to the village, given the respective capacities identified in the IECA report.

Summary

231. On the basis of the above evaluation, officers are satisfied that the cumulative infrastructure impacts of the proposed residential development (in terms of utilities, landscape, open space, healthcare, transport and education) would be acceptable. There is no evidence to demonstrate that the development proposal should be refused on these grounds.

Section 106 Planning Obligation Issues

232. Planning obligations secured must be in accordance with the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, which came into force on 06 April 2010. In particular, Regulation 122 states that a planning obligation may only constitute a reason for approval if it is:
- (a) Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
 - (b) Directly related to the development; and
 - (c) Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
233. These are the three principal tests set out in Paragraph 204 of the Framework and are of relevance in guiding the negotiation of planning obligations sought prior to the coming into force of the CIL Regulations. In assessing potential S106 contributions, officers have also been mindful of Core Strategy Policy CS13 and the Suffolk County Council guidance in respect of Section 106 matters, 'A Developers Guide to Infrastructure Contributions in Suffolk'.

Affordable Housing

234. Policy CS9 of the Forest Heath Core Strategy requires a target of 30% affordable dwellings of schemes of 10 or more dwellings or sites of more than 0.33 hectares.
235. The amended scheme proposes 49 of the dwellings as 'affordable', which represents **30%** of the total number of units for the site. The Council's Housing Officer, in consultation advice, has confirmed general support for the scheme and the provision of affordable housing on the site.
236. In terms of the details of the affordable units, the following mix has been agreed:
- One bed house (2 person) – x 10
 - Two bed house (4 person) - x 26
 - Three bed house (5 person) – x 9
 - Four bed house (6 person) – x 4
237. The Council's Strategy and Enabling Officer has advised that the development proposals cannot be supported, given that some of the affordable dwelling types proposed do not meet the relevant minimum floorspace standards set by the Homes and Community Agency. It is understood that their small size would not be acceptable by a number of Registered Providers who actively operate in the District.
238. Officers are of the opinion that, for the affordable housing provision to be supported there must be a reasonable chance that transfer to a RP can actually occur. At the time of writing this report, the applicant was re-considering the floorspace requirements in respect of the two bedroom units. A verbal update will be given at the committee meeting.
239. In terms of housing tenure, the adopted SPD seeks a tenure split of 70% rented and 30% intermediate in Forest Heath, based on current housing needs evidence. The precise detail of the affordable housing scheme, including tenure

mix and their transfer to a registered provider can be secured through the S106 planning obligation.

240. Third party comments have raised the issue of the future occupants of the affordable housing units. The Council's local letting policy sets out the procedure for such 'lets', which priorities local residents.

Education

241. Education provision in Suffolk is currently in the process of a major restructuring: middle schools are being phased out and their functions are transferring to primary and secondary schools. The local catchment schools are Beck Row Primary School and Mildenhall College Academy. There are currently forecast to be surplus places available at the catchment secondary school serving the proposed development, and no secondary school contributions are sought.
242. It is understood that Beck Row Primary School will not have any surplus places available for children arising from the development scheme. Suffolk County Council is therefore seeking full capital contributions for the additional primary school children forecast to arise to spend on enhancing local provision.
243. In terms of pre-school provision, it is understood that there are two early education providers in Beck Row (Beck Row Pre School and Busy Bees Montessori), offering 270 places. With the level of housing growth coming forward in Beck Row, a developer contribution is sought to mitigate local impacts. Suffolk County Council has confirmed that contributions sought will be invested at a local level to enhance service provision.

Libraries

244. Beck Row is not currently served by a library. Suffolk County Council has identified a need to enhance service provision at the local library, and has requested a capital contribution.
245. A pooling restriction on S106 came into play in April 2015. This restricts the number of times that contributions can be sought for infrastructure projects. Officers are advised that library contributions for Beck Row have already been received the maximum number of times (5). This means that a bespoke project has to be found to spend subsequent contributions upon.
246. SCC has advised that at the time of writing this committee report, there is no bespoke library project. On this basis, it would not be CIL compliant to seek to secure a contribution in respect of libraries. This request has therefore been removed from the draft S106 agreement.

Healthcare

247. A consultation response has been received from Lawson Planning Partnership on behalf of NHS England. This advises that Market Cross Surgery, Mildenhall has existing capacity to accommodate growth. A contribution of £28 600 is sought in respect of the capital required to create additional floorspace at the White House Surgery. The applicant has confirmed the acceptability of this request.

Transport

248. The Highways Engineer, in consultation advice dated 08 September 2015, makes a number of requests which can be secured through the Section 106 agreement:
- Real Time Passenger Information Screen at the nearest bus stop on The Street.
 - Travel Plan – including evaluation and support co-ordination
 - Travel Plan Implementation Bond/Contribution
249. The applicant has confirmed the acceptability of entering into a S106 agreement to secure these contributions.

Public Open Space

250. Development plan policies are supported by the adopted Supplementary Planning Document for public open space, sport and recreation. This document sets out the requirements for on-site and off site provision and maintenance.
251. The scheme layout makes provision for public open space, including structural landscaping along the northern boundary of the site where it abuts Skelton's Drove and the countryside beyond. In accordance with the Council's Supplementary Planning Document, on site and off site provision of open space can be secured by way of S106 agreement.
252. Beck Row Parish Council has questioned whether a contribution will be sought in respect of a new community facility. Officers note that the previous planning application agreed to a contribution of £127 500 in lieu of a shortfall of on site Public Open Space, to be used towards a new community facility.
253. Since the time of the previous planning application, the Council has adopted the SPD for Open Space and Social Infrastructure. The current planning application satisfies the requirements of this SPD. No mechanism exists under the SPD to secure provisions for community facilities, and it would not be CIL compliant to request such a contribution.

Summary

254. The provisions as described above ensure that the effects of the development proposal on local infrastructure within Beck Row, in terms of affordable housing, education, healthcare, public open space and transport, would be acceptable.
255. The proposal would comply with Core Strategy Policy CS13 by which the provision or payment is sought for services, facilities and other improvements directly related to development. Officers are satisfied that the proposed planning obligations meet the three tests of planning obligations set out in the Framework, and are therefore entirely justified.
256. The requests for developer contributions as described above will ensure improvements to existing infrastructure within Beck Row and the local area, to accommodate the growth of the village and meet the needs of the community,

in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS13. Officers are satisfied that they meet the three tests of planning obligations set out in Paragraph 204 of the Framework, and are therefore entirely justified. The planning agent has confirmed the 'in principle' acceptability of entering into a S106 planning obligation to secure these benefits. This is currently in draft form.

Other Issues

257. Third party representations query whether a need exists for these properties, now that they are no longer required for USAF occupation. It is not for the planning officers to question the need for the housing. It is for the developer to decide in the normal course of market analysis whether there is a market for these dwellings.

Land Ownership

258. The occupants of No. 66B The Street have raised concern about land ownership. The applicant has advised that that the application does not involve third party land, and the local planning authority is satisfied that the correct certification has been provided. The developer has been made aware of the third party concerns, and the scheme has been amended to remove the land which is in dispute.

CONCLUSIONS AND PLANNING BALANCE

259. The development proposal has been considered against the objectives of the Framework and the government's agenda for growth. Against this background, national planning policy advice states that planning permission should be granted, unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole. There are no specific policies in the Framework which indicate that this development should be restricted. National policy should therefore be accorded great weight in the consideration of this planning application, especially the presumption in favour of sustainable development, which this proposal is considered to represent.
260. The planning application proposal is considered an acceptable alternative development to the scheme which was previously granted planning permission and which was subsequently implemented.
261. The development proposals would have no significant interests upon interests of acknowledged importance. Beck Row has been identified as a Primary Village that can accommodate some growth within the Council's Core Strategy. The proposed development has a number of positive attributes which lend support to the scheme.
262. In terms of the economic role of sustainable development, the development would generate direct and indirect economic benefits. New housing provides a range of economic benefits, and has significant and positive effects on economic output – for example in terms of capital investment, construction work and occupational expenditure.

263. With regard to the social role of sustainability, the development would provide a level of much needed market and affordable housing to meeting the needs of present and future generations.
264. In the context of the environmental role of sustainable development, the landscape would be irreversibly changed as a result of the development proposals – although this would have only limited impact on the immediate environment. Good design would assist in the mitigation of this impact. Furthermore, the site does not benefit from any specific ecological, landscape or heritage designation. On this basis, the effect on the character of the settlement is considered acceptable.
265. There are not considered to be any planning matters that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme. Officers consider that the benefits of this development would outweigh the dis-benefits of the scheme, and point towards the grant of planning permission.
266. Having regard to the Framework and all other material planning considerations, with the S106 package as set out below (which is necessary for the development to be acceptable in planning terms), the proposal is considered to comply with the NPPF and Development Plan policy. The recommendation is one of approval.

RECOMMENDATION

267. That, subject to the resolution of the size of the affordable housing units to be provided, planning permission is **GRANTED** subject to:

(1) **The completion of a S106 agreement to secure the following (subject to meeting the CIL Reg 122 tests):**

- Policy compliant level and tenure split of affordable housing.
- Education contribution.
- Pre-school contribution.
- Provision of on-site and off site open space.
- Transport contribution.
- Healthcare contribution.

(2) **And the following conditions/informatives:**

1. Time (3 years for commencement).
2. Compliance with approved plans.
3. Highways – Storage of refuse and recycling bins.
4. Highways – Details of carriageways and footways.
5. Highways – Deliveries Management Plan.
6. Highways – Parking.
7. Contamination – further investigative work if found.
8. Foul water disposal details.

9. Surface water drainage details: SuDs management plan.
10. Construction method statement.
11. Working hours.
12. Ground levels details.
13. Details of boundary treatment.
14. Samples of materials.
15. Detailed scheme of hard and soft landscaping.
16. Tree protection.
17. Details of tree works for retained trees.
18. Detailed Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan.
19. Open space management plan.
20. Details of play equipment.
21. Details of lighting.
22. Recommendations of Ecological Appraisal to be implemented.
23. Provision of fire hydrants.
24. Waste minimisation and recycling strategy.

In the event that there are any substantive changes to the S106 package, then this will go back to Members for consideration.

In the event the Applicant declines to enter into a planning obligation to secure the Heads of Terms set out above, for reasons considered unreasonable by the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services, planning permission be refused for the following reasons (as may be appropriate):

1. Unsustainable form of development not mitigating its impact on education provision, open space sport and recreation, transport (contrary to the Framework and Core Strategy Policy CS13).
2. Non compliance with affordable housing policy (contrary to Core Strategy policy CS9 and supporting SPD document).

Documents:

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

<https://planning.westsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=N80V1FPDKBT00>

Alternatively, hard copies are also available to view at Planning, Planning and Regulatory Services, Forest Heath District Council, District Offices, College Heath Road, Mildenhall, Suffolk IP28 7EY