

Parish:	Gayton	
Proposal:	RESERVED MATTERS: Residential development of 40 dwellings, associated estate road access onto Back Street and demolition of existing farm buildings	
Location:	Manor Farm, Back Street, Gayton, King's Lynn, Norfolk, PE32 1QR	
Applicant:	D & K Marsham	
Case No:	19/00694/RMM (Reserved Matters Application)	
Case Officer:	Mrs N Osler	Date for Determination: 17 April 2019 EOT Date: 5 June 2020

Reason for Referral to Planning Committee: Officer recommendation is contrary to Parish Council recommendation and referred by Assistant Director

Neighbourhood Plan: NO

Reserved Matters (RM) are sought for 40 dwellings following the grant of outline planning permission in August 2016 under reference 15/0188/FM.

The outline consent was for 40 dwellings on the housing allocation site for Gayton (G41.1) in the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan, 2016 (SADMP).

This RM application is for 40 dwellings on a slightly smaller site. A full application, that is also before committee today, covers the remainder of the site and is for six dwellings (19/01831/F).

If permission is granted for both of these applications it will result in a total of 46 dwellings on the allocated site rather than the currently approved 40.

Key Issues

- Principle of Development
- Form and Character
- Residential Amenity
- Highways Safety
- S106 Contributions
- Matters Covered by Condition
- Crime and Disorder
- Other Material Considerations

Recommendation

APPROVE

THE APPLICATION

Reserved Matters (layout, scale, appearance and landscaping) are sought for 40 dwellings; access (including a footpath link onto St Nicholas Close) was approved at outline stage.

The dwellings comprise:

Six detached bungalows: 4 x 3-bed (plots 7, 8, 17 and 31) and 2 x 2-bed (plots 5 and 6)

Four x 4-bed detached houses: plots 1, 4, 32 and 33

Twelve pairs of 2-storey dwellings: 2 x 2-bed (plots 11(A), 12(A), 39(A) and 40(A)) and 10 x 3-bed (plots 2, 3, 9(A), 10(A), 13, 14, 15, 16, 27, 28, 29, 30, 34, 35, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45 and 46)

Two x 3-unit terrace properties: 1 x 2-bed (plots 18, 19 and 20(A)) and 1 x 3-bed (plots 36(A), 37(A) and 38)

Eight units are affordable, although if the concurrent full application is approved nine affordable units will be required across both sites. The additional affordable unit is to be provided on this RMM site. The plans show all nine affordable units: plots 9 and 10 (a pair of semi-detached 3-bed units), plots 11 and 12 (a pair of semi-detached 2-bed units), plot 20 (an end terrace of three 2-bed unit), plots 36 and 37 (a mid and end terrace of three 3-bed units) and plots 39 and 40 (a pair of semi-detached 2-bed units).

Units 21 to 26 inclusive fall within the full application site and not this RM application, but for clarity they comprise: 2 x 4-bed detached dwellings and 2 x 2 pairs of semi-detached 3-bed dwellings.

The palette of materials comprises:

Slate

Pantiles

Red multi brick

Cream brick

Cobbled flint

Chalk colour render

Cedar cladding

Boundary treatments consist of 1.8m high close boarded timber fencing between properties; 1.2m high post and rail fencing in combination with hedging is proposed where the site abuts the countryside and between Plot 33 and the open space; an element of walling is proposed at the entrance to the site adjacent to Plot 1 and again adjacent to Plot 4.

This RM site forms the majority of housing allocation G41.1 in the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan, 2016. An extant outline permission exists on the whole site (the area covered by this RM application and the full application) for up to 40 dwellings.

A concurrent Full Application on the remainder of the site (the area not covered by this RM application) is also before committee today. The full application is for six dwellings.

If permission is granted for both then it will result in a total of 46 on the allocated site rather than the currently approved 40.

However whilst both applications should be considered in unison, this RM application for 40 units would be in full compliance with the outline consent and can be considered in isolation from the concurrent full application.

SUPPORTING CASE

This Statement supports the Application for a residential development at Land at Manor Farm, Back Street Gayton, which is allocated in the Local Plan for residential development. The site benefits from Outline Planning Approval for forty dwellings under reference 15/01888/OM and the reserved matters application 19/00694/RMM and 19/01831/F should be considered together to deliver a sustainable comprehensive development across the site. This proposal utilises a site with an extant planning approval that is allocated for residential development in the Local Plan. The full application for 6 dwellings will ensure best and most efficient use of land and rely on the infrastructure of the 40 dwellings approved under the current Outline Approval, this approach will ensure the deliverability of 40 homes counted as part of the land supply and positively contribute to achieving the required 95% test level of homes built.

This proposal makes efficient use of residential development land within Gayton and will deliver an increased number of dwellings on an already approved site without increased harm to the village or surrounding area. In addition, this proposal allows for a greater variety of house types and housing mix. The proposal remains in keeping with the form and character of the area and also the site plan submitted as part of the original Outline Planning Application, with the layout following the indicative layout of the outline application. This approach accords with a key tenet of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to achieve sustainable development and to make the most efficient use of land and densities.

The site layout and housing mix has been developed through informal discussions with the Planning Officer and following detailed research by the development team to ensure that deliverability, saleability, village need, variety and form and character are all considered. As a result, we have Planning Officer support and no technical consultee objections.

The total site has an area of circa. 2.65ha and is C3 residential land with Outline Approval. The proposed development density of the site as a whole including the 6 additional dwellings included as part of this application is 17.34 dwellings per hectare which is considered to make efficient use of residential land as required in the NPPF and also respects the form and character as well as the surrounding densities within the area. St Nicholas Close development has a density of circa. 17.86 dwellings per hectare and the Birch Road area, known locally as the Willows has a density of circa.

Planning Committee
1 June 2020

19.77 dwellings per hectare. The Willows is perhaps most relevant in context terms and is adjacent to this proposal and it should be noted that although we are proposing a total of 46 dwellings this remains 2 dwellings per hectare lower than the Willows.

The increase in numbers allows us to offer the full requirement of affordable housing with the intention of offering additional Build2Rent properties for affordable rent to residents of the village. This proposal offers significantly more than the policy requirement for open space at 2054m² with the requirement being 782m², maintains public footpath links through the site allowing pedestrian access to the school, currently not available, and in addition the woodland is the subject of a management plan to increase its diversity and create a richer under canopy with increased shrubs enhancing landscape amenity, further adding to the open space. This approach creates a green and welcoming gateway and increases the biodiversity of the site over and above its current use as farmland through the introduction of varied features.

The new dwellings will respond to climate change as outlined in the Local Plan and will strive to achieve an 'A' Rated EPC utilising air and ground source heat pumps for heating and hot water and each dwelling will have an electric charging point. They will be designed for low water use and the later introduction of solar panels, solar water heating, with construction materials sourced as locally as possible.

PLANNING HISTORY

19/01831/F: for consideration at this committee meeting with a recommendation of approval: Full application: Construction of 2 detached and 4-semi-detached dwellings

16/00444/OM: Application Refused: 15/09/16 - Outline Major Application: Residential development comprising 40 dwellings to include 8 self-build custom built dwellings and access

15/01888/OM: Application Permitted: 04/08/16 - Outline application: Residential development for 40 dwellings, associated estate road access onto Back Street and demolition of existing farm buildings

RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

Parish Council: OBJECT on the grounds of over-development and not in keeping.

Outline planning permission for this development was granted for 40 houses on the whole site (15/01888/OM; decision August 2016). This application reduces the area of the site, thus increasing the density of the development and changes the fundamental basis of the outline approval. This new layout changes the footprint and green space, the build density makes this not in keeping with houses in the nearest vicinity. Parishioners are upset that the central green space within the village is being lost which changes the ethos of our lovely rural village.

Planning Committee
1 June 2020

The Parish Council welcomes the changes the developer has made since hearing concerns brought to their attention by the Parish Council, but feel that 40 houses on the whole site is much more in keeping and considerably more than the 23 that the Borough Council recommended within the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan, 2016.

Highways Authority: NO OBJECTION the road layout is appropriate and conditions relating to its provision and maintenance are covered on the outline application.

PROW Officer: NO OBJECTION

CSNN: NO OBJECTION subject to conditions relating to drainage, lighting, construction management plan, site hours and air source heat pumps.

Environmental Health & Housing – Environmental Quality: NO OBJECTION

Open Space Team: NO OBJECTION

Arboricultural Officer: NO OBJECTION

Housing Team: NO OBJECTION

LLFA: Does not wish to comment

Waste and Recycling Team: NO OBJECTION

Natural England: No comments to make

Historic England: Does not wish to comment

Architectural Liaison & Crime Prevention Officer: The revised design is much improved [on the original indicative outline] therefore, no comments or recommendations to make

Norfolk Fire & Rescue: NO OBJECTIONS

REPRESENTATIONS

Sixteen letters of objection and two letters neither objecting nor supporting, but raising issues have been received. The objections / issues can be summarised as:

- Back Street won't be able to cope with the traffic associated with this development which will result in highway safety issues
- Contamination hasn't been fully considered
- Drainage hasn't been fully considered
- Questions the validity of the application as it is more than a simple revision to 15/01888/OM
- Is there a footpath link to St Nicholas Close?

- 40 dwellings on the site is overdevelopment and too dense and results in dwellings with gardens that are too small for them
- The development is not in keeping with the dwelling along Back Street
- The area will be overhoused as this will result in 46 dwellings on the site and not in keeping with Gayton's existing buildings
- Loss of green space / wildlife habitat
- Noise
- Strain on drainage system
- Infrastructure and services (schools / doctors) won't be able to cope
- A building is shown at the rear of No.35 Back Street that has never existed; [plot 10] will overlook by bedroom reducing privacy
- Additional demand on already stretched local sewerage pumping station
- The school should be sorted before more houses are approved
- The houses down Church View are struggling to sell; do we really need 40 more houses?
- Access to the rear of houses 36-48 Back Street is already tight; the development might result in the loss of parking to the rear of these properties which would result in parking to the front of these properties
- There is not sufficient parking for the development that will mean people park on Back Street
- Where will emergency vehicles and dust carts turn round?
- There should be a central green space within the development
- The roads [within the proposed development] have no pavements; how does this support walking?
- What landscaping / planting is proposed?
- Close boarded timber fencing is not attractive and does not enable the passage of wildlife such as hedgehogs
- Will the application address the shortfall in affordable housing for people to buy?
- Is a play area being provided?
- The connectivity of the development should be improved
- Negative impact on the value of neighbouring properties
- Loss of views
- Overlooking from Plot 16 to the patio and fully glazed conservatory of Fieldside (the latter of which, along with other extensions to Fieldside are not shown on the plans)
- The visibility splay to the site appears tight
- The internal roads within the development do not appear wide enough
- There are no turning circles for emergency / utility vehicles
- Are there plans for the section of road [adjacent to the full application site] to lead into a further development site?
- The development is not in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan. In this regard the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group has made a substantial submission in relation to the compliance of the proposal against the emerging policies in the Plan.

LDF CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

CS01 – Spatial Strategy

CS02 – Settlement Hierarchy

CS06 – Rural Areas

CS08 – Sustainable Development

CS09 – Housing

CS11 – Transportation

CS12 – Environmental Assets

CS14 – Infrastructure Provision

SITE ALLOCATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES PLAN 2016

DM1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

DM8 – Delivering Affordable Housing on Phased Development

DM15 – Environment, Design and Amenity

DM16 – Provision of Recreational Open Space for Residential Developments

DM17 – Parking Provision in New Development

G41.1 – Gayton – Land north of Back Street

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN POLICIES

N/A

NATIONAL GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)
National Design Guide 2019

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The key issues identified in the consideration of this application are as follows:

Planning Committee
1 June 2020

Principle of Development
Form and Character
Residential Amenity
Highways Safety
S106 Contributions
Matters Covered by Condition
Crime and Disorder
Other Material Considerations

Principle of Development

The principle of residential development of this site has been found acceptable by extant outline permission 15/01888/OM for up to 40 dwellings on the housing allocation site in the SADMP (G41.1).

However, this RM application only comprises part of the outline site / G41.1 (albeit the majority), with the remainder of the site being covered by full application (19/01831/F) for a further six dwellings.

If both applications are approved it would result in a further six dwellings on the site totalling 46 and a doubling of the figure of 23 suggested in the SADMP, 2016. It is important to note however that the figure of 23 was a minimum figure and the extant permission for 40 is the material consideration.

For reasons covered in more detail below and in specific detail under the full application, officers believe the site can accommodate the combined number of 46 proposed by the two applications.

However, this RM application should be considered on its own merits of which it is in compliance with the extant outline permission.

Form and Character

The site lies between pairs of semi-detached single and two storey council / ex council properties to the east (St Nicholas Close) and southeast (Back Street). Two more modern bungalows / chalet bungalows lie to the immediate southeast corner of the site, Fieldside (which is identified as Syrusa on the plans) is a chalet bungalow and Creg-ny-baa is a bungalow. Running parallel to the south of the site are older properties fronting Back Street comprising detached and semi-detached dwellings whilst on the opposite side of Back Street terrace units can also be found. To the west are the more modern dwellings of Birch Road (part of the Willows Estate) that are separated from the site by an area of retained woodland.

As such there is a wide variety of dwelling types, ages, scales, masses, materials and densities in the immediate locality of the site although the vast majority are two-storey with the occasional bungalow interspersed.

The mix of detached, semi-detached and terrace dwellings proposed including the mix of single and two-storey units, along with the pallet of materials that includes

both traditional and modern, are therefore considered to reflect the diversity of dwellings in the locality of the site.

The layout is that of a comprehensive estate type development that again can be seen throughout the settlement of Gayton.

In terms of accommodating 40 units, the layout does not appear cramped with the amount of open space far exceeding policy requirements (2,054m² proposed : 680m² required) and garden sizes considered to be reflective of the size of units they serve. Likewise, in terms of accommodating 46 units, the layout still does not appear cramped and in officer's opinion makes efficient use of land (as required by paragraphs 117, 122 and 123 of the NPPF). Open space provision still far exceeds policy requirements.

The applicant suggests the density of the development, including the 6 dwellings proposed under the full application, is 17.34 dwellings/ha, which is less than both St Nicholas Close (17.86 dwellings/ha) and Birch Road (19.77 dwellings/ha). This is largely as a result of the large area of open space being provided that would benefit not just this development (although that is its main requirement), but occupiers of neighbouring developments too. This again suggests that the most efficient use of land would be to accommodate 46 units on the allocation rather than 40.

It is therefore considered that the RM application, as a standalone application for 40 units, would not be of detriment to the visual amenity of the locality. Furthermore, it is also considered that, whilst acknowledging it is not a view shared by the Parish Council or the majority of third party representatives, a development comprising of both the RM and full application would not be of detriment to the visual amenity of the locality either.

Residential Amenity

The most affected non-associated properties are going to be those that abut the site, with Fieldside (the chalet bungalow to the immediate southeast) being the most affected as it has development proposed to both its northern and western boundaries. However, the property to the immediate north of Fieldside (plot 17) is a single-storey unit, the closest element of which (in terms of the dwelling) is shown to sit c.8.5 metres from the boundary of Fieldside and 12.5m from the northern elevation of Fieldside. Furthermore, Fieldside will be largely screened from the dwelling by its own extended garage and the garage proposed to serve plot 17. The new garage serving plot 17 is shown to be c.2m from the northern boundary of Fieldside and c.6m from its northern elevation. However, the eaves of the garage are 2.4m in height and the ridge 3.8m. The garage would sit adjacent to the driveway of Fieldside; this, coupled with the height of the proposed garage and orientation (to the north), suggests that any overbearing or overshadowing impacts would be limited and acceptable. The position of the garage serving plot 17 also restricts views from Fieldside into the majority of the private amenity space (rear garden) of plot 17. Whilst this would affect the views from Fieldside, there is no right to a public view although outlook is a consideration. In this regard it is considered Fieldside would retain an acceptable outlook due to the single storey nature of plot 17.

Plot 16 lies to the immediate west of both Fieldside and Creg-ny-baa. However the eastern elevation of Plot 16 is shown to be some 23 metres from the rear elevation of Fieldview's conservatory; a distance that should ensure there would be no material overshadowing of the conservatory. Whilst some overshadowing to the rear gardens of both Fieldview and Creg-ny-baa would occur, it would be for limited periods of the day and therefore not sufficient enough to warrant refusal.

The only first-floor window on the eastern elevation serving Plot 16 is shown to serve a bathroom (a non-habitable room). However given its location, in close proximity to the rear boundaries of Fieldside and Creg-ny-baa, overlooking could occur if the window was not glazed with obscure glass and could be opened. As such a condition would be placed on this window if permission were granted ensuring that it was glazed with obscure glass and is non-opening.

In summary, in relation to the impacts on Fieldside and Creg-ny-baa, whilst there would be some impacts they are not considered to be of a degree to warrant refusal.

The properties in St Nicholas Close are separated from the site by the road serving them. This separation, coupled with the distances between elevations (the closest being 37 metres), means there would be no material overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing impacts to properties in St Nicholas Close.

The properties running along the rear boundaries of the proposed development (those fronting Back Street) are all to the south of the proposed development (meaning there would be no material overshadowing) and are of distances that suggest there would be no material overlooking. The closest relationship being between plot 15 and no.39 Back Street with a distance shown to be c.26.5m between dwellings.

The properties to the west are separated from the site by a considerable distance as well as a large area of retained woodland. There would therefore be no material impacts on these dwellings.

Inter-developmental relationships are considered acceptable with the closest relationships being between units 39 and 40 with 41 and 42. Strategic tree planting is proposed between these properties that will ensure overlooking is not material. Landscaping will be conditioned if permission is granted.

In conclusion it is considered that the layout has taken appropriate consideration of the impacts on existing residential properties and there are no impacts that are considered to be of an unacceptable degree.

Highway Safety

Vehicular access onto Back Street (and any off-site highway improvement works) were approved at outline stage as was the provision of the footpath link onto St Nicholas Close. These issues do not need further consideration under the current application. Likewise, the impact of vehicular activity associated with 40 units would also have been fully considered at the outline stage and is not a consideration of this

Planning Committee
1 June 2020

RM application either. However, the increase in vehicular activity of the additional six units is a consideration, but a consideration of the full application, not this RM application.

The internal road layout / types / turning heads are all acceptable to the Local Highway Authority, as is parking provision. Full details of road specifications and their timely provision and future management and maintenance are covered under the outline permission and do not therefore require duplication of condition if permission is granted under this RM application.

However parking provision, that is not covered under the outline permission, will need to be suitably conditioned if permission is granted.

S106 Contributions

Contributions that comprise: affordable housing (eight on-site units), open space provision, management and maintenance (at least 17m² per dwelling (680m²)), habitat mitigation fee (£50 / dwelling (£2,000)), contribution towards Gayton Primary School (£3,039 / dwelling (£121,560)), and contribution towards Gaywood Library (£60 / dwelling (£2,400)) are already secured by a S106 Agreement linked to the outline permission. Approval of this RM application will not affect the requirements of the S106 Agreement.

Matters Covered by Condition

The following matters are already covered by condition on the outline consent and do not require duplication if permission is granted on this RM application: road specification(s) and their timely provision and future management and maintenance, provision of visibility splays, off-site highway improvement works, foul and surface water drainage, contamination, protection of existing trees / hedgerows, archaeology, protected species, provision of fire hydrant(s), asbestos and construction management.

Crime and Disorder

There are no specific crime and disorder issues raised by this proposal with the Architectural Liaison & Crime Prevention Officer stating that the revised design is much improved [on the original indicative outline].

Other Material Considerations

CSNN has requested conditions relating to: drainage, lighting, construction management (CMP), site hours and air source heat pumps. Drainage and construction management are already covered under the outline consent. Lighting and air source heat pumps can and should be suitably conditioned if permission is granted. However, site hours do not fall within the parameters of an RM application and cannot therefore be conditioned under any permission granted under this application. Notwithstanding this, it is considered that there is enough scope within the CMP condition already appended to the outline consent to cover this aspect.

In relation to comments raised by third parties, your officer comments as follows:

- Back Street won't be able to cope with the traffic associated with this development which will result in highway safety issues – 40 dwellings accessing the site from Back Street was fully considered at the outline stage and found to be acceptable
- Contamination hasn't been fully considered – this is conditioned on the outline approval
- Drainage hasn't been fully considered - this is conditioned on the outline approval
- Questions the validity of the application as it is more than a simple revision to 15/01888/OM – the application is valid and in accordance with the outline permission
- Is there a footpath link to St Nicholas Close? – yes, as shown on drawing no. 1001 Rev.E it runs between plots 20 (RM site) and 21 (full site). Regardless of whether or not the full application is approved the footpath link to St Nicholas Close has to be provided as per drawing no. 1001 Rev.E as it is a requirement of the allocation as well as the outline scheme
- 40 dwellings on the site is overdevelopment and too dense and results in dwellings with gardens that are too small for them – this is considered to be fully covered in the main body of the report above
- The development is not in keeping with the dwelling along Back Street - this is considered to be fully covered in the main body of the report above
- The area will be overhoused as this will result in 46 dwellings on the site and not in keeping with Gayton's existing buildings – approval of this application will result in 40 dwellings and for the reasons covered in the main body of the report officers do not consider it is overdevelopment of the site
- Loss of green space – the principle of the loss of the site has been established by the outline permission and preceding that it's allocation as a housing site in the SADMP
- Impact on wildlife – protected species are covered by condition on the outline permission
- Noise – there will undoubtedly be noise during the construction period and associated with the finalised development. Noise associated with construction can be controlled by the Construction Management Plan that is a condition on the outline, whilst the noise associated with a residential development, is not considered reason to preclude housing development within a central village location
- A building is shown at the rear of No.35 Back Street that has never existed; [plot 10] will overlook by bedroom reducing privacy – the building shown at the rear of No.35 was not a consideration in the consideration of this application as it could not be seen. In relation to overlooking, the first floor windows of Plot 10 are some 30 metres from the closest rear elevation of No.35, a distance that suggests there would be no material window-to-window overlooking
- Additional demand on already stretched local sewerage pumping station – the ability of the sewerage system to accommodate the development would have been a consideration at the outline stage

- The school should be sorted before more houses are approved – permission is now granted for the school. Furthermore approval of this application would secure an additional £121,560 towards the school
- The houses down Church View are struggling to sell; do we really need 40 more houses? The principle of development is already established
- Access to the rear of houses 36-48 Back Street is already tight; the development might result in the loss of parking to the rear of these properties which would result in parking to the front of these properties. The development does not encroach outside of its site boundaries and it should therefore have no impact in this regard
- There is not sufficient parking for the development that will mean people park on Back Street – parking provision is in accordance with current parking standards. Notwithstanding this, your officers consider it highly unlikely that any overspill parking (which shouldn't occur) would encroach onto Back Street, it is more likely to be contained within the site
- Where will emergency vehicles and dust carts turn round? The Local Highway Authority will have fully considered these aspects and such vehicles will turn at the turning heads as necessary
- There should be a central green space within the development – it is considered the large, multi-functional open space area at the entrance to the site suitably serves both the development and the wider community
- The roads [within the proposed development] have no pavements; how does this support walking? The roads within the development do have pavements
- What landscaping / planting is proposed? Landscaping / planting is as shown on the plans
- Close boarded timber fencing is not attractive and does not enable the passage of wildlife such as hedgehogs – close boarded timber fencing is considered an appropriate form of boundary treatment. Furthermore areas where the site abuts the countryside and the open space have softer boundary treatments.
- Will the application address the shortfall in affordable housing for people to buy? Affordable housing provision is in line with policy requirements
- Is a play area being provided? Yes, a LAP (Local Area of Play) specifically for younger children is being provided as shown on the plans
- Negative impact on the value of neighbouring properties – this is not a material planning consideration
- Loss of views – the loss of a private view is not a material planning consideration
- Overlooking from Plot 16 to the patio and fully glazed conservatory of Fieldside (the latter of which, along with other extensions to Fieldside are not shown on the plans) – the impacts from the proposed development on Fieldside have been covered in depth in the main body of the report
- The visibility splay to the site appear tight – this was approved at the outline stage and considered to comply with standards by the Local Highway Authority
- Are there plans for the section of road [adjacent to the full application site] to lead into a further development site? Any future proposals for residential development of land adjacent to the site will require planning permission; no such planning permission is currently being sought

- The development is not in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan. In this regard the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group has made a substantial submission in relation to the compliance of the proposal against the emerging policies in the Plan. However the Neighbourhood Plan does not carry sufficient weight to be a material consideration in the determination of this application. It is therefore not considered necessary to counter the 13 pages of notes submitted by the Steering Group. It should however be noted that the majority of issues raised by the Steering Group have also been raised by third parties and have therefore been commented on above.

CONCLUSION

Officers consider that the development proposed under this RM application is in accordance with the outline consent, although it would render the northeast corner of the outline site / allocation undeveloped if Members resolve not to approve the concurrent full application before them today.

If Members approve both applications then the entire allocation site would be able to be built-out with a total of 46 dwellings as opposed to the current approval of 40 dwellings.

Officers consider that the wider site could accommodate 46 dwellings without being of detriment to the visual amenity of the locality, highway safety or residential amenity, and that such a figure makes most efficient use of the land as required by the NPPF.

The scale, mass, density, appearance and impacts of / from the proposed dwellings have been shown to be acceptable.

No objections have been received from statutory consultees on technical grounds.

It is therefore recommended that this application be approved subject to the following conditions.

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. Condition: Other than in relation to phasing, the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans / drawing nos:

SE-1126 PP-1001 Rev.E
SE-1126 PP-1101 Rev.C
SE-1126 PP-1102 Rev.C
SE-1126 PP-1103 Rev.C
SE-1126 PP-1104 Rev.C
SE-1126 PP-1105 Rev.C

Planning Committee
1 June 2020

SE-1126 PP-1106 Rev.E
SE-1126 PP-1107 Rev.E
SE-1126 PP-1108 Rev.B
SE-1126 PP-1109 Rev.A
SE-1126 PP-1110 Rev.A
SE-1126 PP-1111 Rev.A
SE-1126 PP-1112
SE-1126 PP-1113

1. Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
2. Condition: In relation to phasing, the development shall be phased as shown on approved drawing SE-1126 PP-1001 Rev.E unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
2. Reason: For the avoidance of doubt, in the interests of proper planning and to enable some flexibility if required.
3. Condition: Prior to the installation of any outdoor lighting, a detailed outdoor lighting scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of the type of lights, the orientation/angle of the luminaries, the spacing and height of any lighting columns, the extent / levels of illumination over the site and on adjacent land and the measures to contain light within the curtilage of the site. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme prior to the first occupation of any dwelling hereby permitted, or in accordance with a rolling programme of provision, and shall thereafter be maintained and retained as agreed.
3. Reason: In the interests of minimising light pollution and to safeguard the amenities of the locality in accordance with the NPPF and Development Plan.
4. Condition: Prior to the installation of any air source heat pump(s) a detailed scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall specify the make, model and sound power levels of the proposed unit(s), the siting of the unit(s) and the distances from the proposed unit(s) to the boundaries with neighbouring dwellings, plus provide details of anti-vibration mounts, and noise attenuation measures. The scheme shall be implemented as approved and thereafter maintained as such.
4. Reason: To ensure that the amenities of both existing and future occupants are safeguarded in accordance with the NPPF and Development Plan.
5. Condition: Prior to the first occupation of each dwelling hereby permitted the proposed on-site car parking and turning area shall be laid out, levelled, surfaced and drained in accordance with the approved plan and retained thereafter available for that specific use.

5. Reason: To ensure the permanent availability of the parking / manoeuvring area, in the interests of highway safety in accordance with the NPPF and Development Plan.
6. Condition: All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation or use of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Any trees or plants that within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species as those originally planted, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written approval to any variation.
6. Reason: To ensure that the work is carried out within a reasonable period in accordance with the NPPF and Development Plan.
7. Condition: The first floor window on the eastern elevation of Plot 16 shown on the approved plans to serve the bathroom, shall be glazed with obscure glass and shall be non-opening and shall thereafter be retained in that condition.
7. Reason: In the interests of the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties in accordance with the NPPF and Development Plan.