

AGENDA ITEM NO: 8/2(a)

Parish:	Snettisham	
Proposal:	Residential development of land to provide 23 residential dwellings together with associated access road, parking, garaging and public open space (revised scheme to 13/01736/FM)	
Location:	Land At Common Road Snettisham Norfolk	
Applicant:	Hopkins And Moore (Developments) Ltd	
Case No:	14/00944/FM (Full Application - Major Development)	
Case Officer:	Mrs K Lawty Tel: 01553 616403	Date for Determination: 1 October 2014

Reason for Referral to Planning Committee – Raises issues of wider concern.

Case Summary

The application site relates to a rectangular shaped parcel of land on the southern side of Common Road at the western end of the village of Snettisham. The site is currently a grassed paddock of approximately 0.8 ha in area and provides open space between residential properties along Common Road.

The dwellings to the west of the site are within the established village settlement boundary and dwellings to the south east are also within the village. The dwellings immediately to the east of the site are affordable houses and were approved as a rural exceptions site. The dwellings on the northern side of Common Road further east are also affordable houses approved as a rural exceptions site.

To the north are open agricultural fields.

The land levels across the site are relatively consistent.

This site is the preferred option for development in Snettisham identified in the ongoing 'Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Pre-Submission Document' which is currently out for public consultation. This document includes a further triangular shaped site to the south, amounting to 1.5 hectares, where Draft Policy G83.1 sets out the planned policy intentions for the overall site for residential development of 34 dwellings. It is the only allocated site in Snettisham for future development in the borough up to 2026.

Members may recall a planning application for residential development on this site which was refused at Planning Committee in June of this year. No objection was raised to the principle of development on this site but the reasons for refusal referred to the layout and design of the affordable housing and insufficient car parking due to the small garage sizes. An appeal against this decision has been lodged by the applicant.

Since this time the site allocation has been amended to incorporate the additional land to the south of this application site. This adjoining land is in different land ownership and does not form part of this current application site. However, the proposed layout does allow for access through to this additional parcel of land.

This current application seeks full planning permission for the construction of 23 dwellings, including 5 No. affordable housing units; together with associated access road, parking, garaging and public open space, albeit of a revised design. This current application seeks to address the reasons for refusal of the earlier application, as well as taking into account the proposed change to the draft allocation.

Like the previous proposal this application proposes a single vehicular access point into the site from Common Road to the north. Pedestrian access points are shown to the north east corner and north west part of the site.

The site is within the countryside as depicted on the adopted local plan proposals map (1998) and just beyond the AONB.

Key Issues

Planning history;
The principle of development on this site;
Impact upon the AONB;
Design, character and appearance;
Impact upon Residential Amenity;
Affordable housing;
Highway Issues;
Flood Risk;
Crime and Disorder Act 1998;
Archaeology;
Foul and Surface Water Drainage Details
Contamination;
Lighting Scheme;
Other material considerations.

Recommendation

A) APPROVE subject to conditions and completion of Section 106 Agreement.

B) In the event that the Section 106 agreement is not completed within 3 months of the date of this Committee meeting, the application shall be **REFUSED** due to the failure to secure affordable housing, public open space and county contributions.

THE APPLICATION

The application site relates to a rectangular shaped parcel of land on the southern side of Common Road at the western end of the village of Snettisham. The site is currently a grassed paddock of approximately 0.8 ha in area and provides open space between residential properties along Common Road.

The dwellings to the west of the site are within the established village settlement boundary and dwellings to the south east are also within the village. The dwellings immediately to the east of the site are affordable houses and were approved as a rural exception site. The dwellings on the northern side of Common Road further east are also affordable houses approved as a rural exception site.

To the north are open agricultural fields.

The land levels across the site are relatively consistent.

This application seeks full planning permission for the construction of 23 dwellings, including 5 No. units or 20% affordable housing, together with associated access road, parking, garaging and public open space.

The revised scheme seeks to address the reasons for refusal of the previous application relating the design and layout of the affordable housing units and the small dimension of the garages.

The proposed housing mix is:-

- 11 no. x 3 bedroom units – market houses
- 4 no. x 4 bedroom units – market houses
- 2 no. x 2 bedroom unit – market houses
- 1 no. x 2 bedroom apartment – market houses
- 1 no. 3 bedroom affordable house
- 3 no. 2 bedroom affordable houses
- 1 no. 1 bedroom affordable house

The application proposes a single vehicular access point into the site from Common Road to the north. Pedestrian access points are shown to the north east corner and north west part of the site.

The site is within the countryside as depicted on the adopted local plan proposals map (1998) and just beyond the AONB.

The site is, however, part of the preferred option site for development in Snettisham identified in the ongoing Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Pre-submission Document for future development in the borough up to 2026. Policy G83.1 sets out the planned policy intentions for the larger site for residential development of 34 dwellings. The southern part of the site allocation does not form part of this planning application, although provision has been made within the layout of this proposed development for vehicular access through to this land at a later date.

A previous application for 24 dwellings on the site was refused planning permission at the Planning Committee meeting of 2 June 2014. The details are referred to below. An appeal has been lodged with the Planning Inspectorate against this decision, but at the time of writing no decision has been made.

SUPPORTING CASE

The application has been supported by a raft of documents. These include:-

- Design and Access Statement
- Planning Statement
- Flood Risk Assessment
- Habitat Survey
- Reptile Survey
- Bat Activity Survey
- Desk Study Report (Contamination)
- S106 Heads of Terms
- Building for Life Assessment

- Landscape and Visual Assessment
- Landscape Strategy Plan
- Tree Protection Plan
- Sustainability Statement
- Statement of Community Engagement
- Proposed Scheme of External Lighting

The DAS summarises the scheme thus:

‘This Full Planning Application, together with the accompanying and enclosed supporting documentation, sets out a comprehensive approach to the development of this site. An opportunity has been taken to provide a scheme which responds well to the site circumstances and suitably enhances the character and appearance of the surrounding area, maximising the positive aspects of the sites situation whilst providing much needed additional housing, including affordable housing, for the village.

The development represents a design-led bespoke project, which deals sensitively in terms of its response to the constraints of the site. The approval of this application would accord with the design and layout policies of the development plan and with national planning policies, which encourage good design. The proposals are fully representative of the quality and content of developments which are encouraged by the modern planning system.’

The Planning Statement summarises the scheme thus:

‘The submitted planning application and supporting documentation set out a comprehensive approach to the residential development of this site. An opportunity has been taken to provide an attractive, inclusive development which responds well to the specific circumstances of the locality, maximising the positive aspects of the site’s location, whilst sensitively respecting the existing streetscene and the semi-rural character and appearance of the wider surroundings.

The locations of the site, within close walking distance of existing facilities within the village and regular public transport routes to further afield indicate that the site is both a suitable and sustainable location to accommodate further residential development, in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF.

This fact is echoed by the Local Planning Authorities proposed allocation of the site for residential development within their current ‘Preferred Options Detailed Policies and Sites Plan’ Development Plan Document, thus confirming recognition of this at a local level.

The proposed development is therefore fully representative of the quality and content of developments which are actively encouraged and supported by Government Policy.’

The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment concludes:

‘In respect of the Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) to the north of the site, the development within the application site will have no adverse effect on the views experienced from within the AONB. The application site will add an area of housing to the existing settlement. Development within the site would be seen in context of the existing residential settlement of Snettisham, which encompasses the proposed development to the south, east and west. As the change from greenfield to residential development will be experienced it is important to note that the setting of the AONB or the character of the wooded landscape will not be affected by the residential development. Over time the structural landscape planting, in particular the hedgerow and trees along Common Road and the open space to the north will visually integrate the new settlement into the surroundings.

The proposed development therefore creates an opportunity to enhance the transition from the existing settlement edge and the centre of Snettisham, and characteristic features within the Wooded Slopes with Estate Land.'

The Flood Risk Assessment concludes:

'The proposed new residential development on the land to be accessed off Common Rd, Snettisham has been assessed for the risk to the development on the site from fluvial flooding in accordance with the guidelines of the NPPF. Assessment has also been made of the impact of the proposed development on the existing floodplain storage at this location, and of the risk of storm water contribution from the development exacerbating downstream flooding, as directed by the guidance.

The site has been found to lie within Flood Zone 1 and is therefore not considered to be at risk from fluvial flooding. Other sources of flooding have similarly been assessed and found to pose no threat to development on the site.

The proposals do not affect flood storage within the floodplain and the peak surface water runoff rate leaving the site will be attenuated to a similar level as existing. Surface water drainage from the site will mimic the existing drainage regime of the land making maximum use of infiltration with any surplus discharging to the Anglian Water network. It is considered from this assessment that the level of risk of flooding to and from the proposed development is of an acceptable level.

Investigation has been carried out into the reported surface water flooding immediately downstream of the site. An assessment has been made of the cause of the occasional flooding and as well as confirming that the proposed development will not exacerbate it proposals have been made to help alleviate it.'

PLANNING HISTORY

13/01736/FM - Residential development of 24 dwellings together with associated access road, parking, garaging and public open space (Amended scheme) – Refused

RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

Parish Council: NO OBJECTION – In principle the Council is not against this development - we accept the need for more housing, and particularly of the affordable variety, but are extremely frustrated that our repeatedly expressed views regarding the drainage issue surrounding this development are not being heeded.

We have been assured that drainage has been taken account of, but, even at the day of the meeting, a councillor reported that he had visited the site and reported on storm water being a "massive problem" and people being "under terrible threat".

That is the current situation. If there is no suggestion, therefore, as to how the developers propose to improve the situation (not simply accepting the status quo), there is no conceivable way in which Council's views can be regarded as having been considered.

With an additional development, which cannot but make things worse, it is therefore absolutely essential, in Council's view, that we do not leave things as they are, given how bad that clearly is. Indeed the development should offer an opportunity (in fact an obligation) to improve things.

We have clear support for these views from the large number of members of the public who attend our meetings, and these, along with our councillors, are those who live in the Village and know the situation. It has been raised with the authorities responsible at meetings and individually on many occasions.

My sense of the Council's mood is that it believes it could be a catastrophe if such a potentially positive development simply added to the problems which the Village already faces, when it could be a beacon of excellence, alleviating those problems and being a welcome addition to the Village.

Highways Authority: NO OBJECTION – conditionally

Environment Agency: NO OBJECTION

Water Management Alliance: No comments as outside their district

Anglian Water - NO OBJECTION – conditionally

Natural England: NO OBJECTION - with regard to statutory nature conservation sites and no comment with regard to protected landscapes on this development proposal.

Housing Enabling Officer – NO OBJECTION - conditionally

NCC Planning Obligations – NO OBJECTION - conditionally

Tree Officer: NO OBJECTION – conditionally

National Grid: NO OBJECTION – informed applicant they have equipment on the site

Historic Environment Service – NO OBJECTION - An archaeological evaluation was carried out at the site under the previous planning application 13/01736/FM. Based on the results of the evaluation no further archaeological work is required at the site and we do not wish to make any recommendations on the current application.

Environmental Health & Housing - Environmental Quality: No comments

Environmental Health & Housing - CSNN: No comments received

Parks Manager: NO OBJECTION - conditionally but raised concern regarding position of public open space

Norfolk Coast Partnership – No comments received but previously raised no objection to application 13/01736/FM.

Norfolk Wildlife Trust – No comments received but previously raised no objection to application 13/01736/FM.

Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service - No comments received but previously raised no objection to application 13/01736/FM, subject to the provision of a fire hydrant.

Norfolk Constabulary: NO OBJECTION – following submission of amended layout plan.

REPRESENTATIONS

Seven pieces of correspondence received from four addresses referring to the following:-

- In the whole village of Snettisham this is the one most prone to flooding and cannot understand why this was chosen
- Most of the surface water drainage for Snettisham comes together on Common Road and the place it comes together is right in the corner of this proposed development and taken away by 8 inch pipe
- By allowing more and more homes in Snettisham without addressing the drainage issues the Councils are acting irresponsibly; this development will add to the existing problem
- East of England Plan Policy WAT4 requires that existing properties should be defended from flooding and new development should be located where there is little or no risk of flooding
- The Land Drainage Act 1991 refers to the right to have a decent drainage system
- The Harrison Group Environmental Report mentions the high water table on this site which, when taken with the albeit low radon levels and the intended drainage plan for this development must mean that at some point radon will find its way into the Anglia Water system which does not have the filtration to cope with radon affected water
- Given that radon is not indigenous to the site it is not unreasonable to expect Hopkins Homes to clear the site of radon before proceeding
- Given the high water table the swales will not be effective; they will not only drain off surface water but also water from the surrounding land
- Concerns over increase in traffic on narrow road – Common Road/Alma Road
- Overdevelopment of the site; treating people like battery hens
- 25 dwellings is too excessive; will change the character
- Concerns over increase in traffic on narrow road – Common Road/Alma Road
- Overdevelopment of the site; treating people like battery hens
- 24 dwellings is too excessive; will change the character
- Concerns that it will increase flooding
- query size and location of play area
- Noise from development and public open space
- Overlooking from proposed dwellings and loss of privacy
- Full removal of part of the existing hedge
- The open space is totally open to Common Road, the private road and the turning circle, creating danger
- Access through to the land at the rear just increases all of the problems of the high density plan

NATIONAL GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework – sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.

National Planning Practice Guidance - Provides National Planning Practice Guidance, in support of and in addition to the NPPF

PLANNING POLICIES

The King's Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan (1998) contains the following saved policies that are relevant to the proposal:

4/21 - indicates that in built-up areas of towns or villages identified on the Proposals Map as Built Environment Type C or D development will be permitted where it is in character with the locality.

LDF CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

CS01 - Spatial Strategy

CS01 - Spatial Strategy

CS06 - Development in Rural Areas

CS08 - Sustainable Development

CS09 - Housing Distribution

CS11 – Transport

CS12 - Environmental Assets

SITE ALLOCATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES PRE-SUBMISSION DOCUMENT

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

Policy G83.1 – Snettisham – Land South of Common Road and behind Teal Close

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The key principle issues to be addressed in this instance are: -

- Planning history
- The principle of development on this site;
- Impact upon the AONB;
- Design, character and appearance;
- Impact upon Residential Amenity;
- Affordable housing;
- Highway Issues;
- Drainage;
- Crime and Disorder Act 1998;
- Archaeology;
- Ecology;
- Contamination;
- Lighting Scheme;
- Other material considerations.

Planning history

In 2014 a planning application for residential development of 24 dwellings together with associated access road, parking, garaging and public open space (Amended scheme) was submitted on this site (lpa ref: 13/01736/FM) . The planning application was refused by the Planning Committee on 2 June 2014.

The application was refused for the following reasons:-

1. The affordable housing units proposed on the site are of an unattractive design in comparison to the open market units proposed and as such would be easily distinguishable from the rest of the development, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Planning Practice Guidance, and policy CS06 of the LDF Core Strategy.
2. The affordable housing units are clustered together in a cramped layout in one corner of the site. They are therefore not well integrated within the proposed scheme, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Planning Practice Guidance, and CS06 of the LDF Core Strategy.
3. The proposed car parking arrangements, specifically the provision of garages of a size considered too small to count as parking spaces, which is contrary to Norfolk County Council's guidance on parking standards, results in insufficient off-street car parking for the development, to the detriment of the amenity of the general locality and contrary to policy CS11 of the LDF Core Strategy.

The applicant has since lodged an appeal with the Planning Inspectorate against this decision and this appeal is ongoing.

This current application seeks to address the reasons for refusal which relate to the design and layout of the affordable housing and the inadequate dimensions of the proposed garages.

However, since this time the boundary of the site allocation has been amended to incorporate additional land to the south of this application site. This adjoining land is in different land ownership and does not form part of this current application site. However, the proposed layout does allow for access through to this additional parcel of land to accommodate future development of the site. This results in the loss of one residential unit.

The applicant has also revised the layout so that four of the affordable housing units are now located at the front of the site with a single unit sited towards the rear of the site. The four units to the front contain carstone and more details, including chimneys and porches. The single detached dwelling is located next to other dwellings of similar design.

Principle of Development

The site currently lies outside the village boundary of Snettisham and is denoted as countryside on the Adopted Local Plan inset map. The dwellings to the west of the site are within the established village settlement boundary and dwellings to the south east are also within the village. The dwellings immediately to the east of the site are affordable houses and were approved as a rural exceptions site. The dwellings on the northern side of Common Road further east are also affordable houses approved as a rural exceptions site.

The land to the north is open fields. The Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) boundary runs along the northern side of Common Road so this site is not in it, but is adjacent to the AONB.

There are a number of policy statements relevant to this application and the key aspects are summarised below.

In the Core Strategy Snettisham is identified as a Key Rural Service Centre where limited growth of a scale and nature appropriate to secure the sustainability of each settlement will be supported within the Development Limits of the Key Rural Service Centre in accordance with Policy CS06 Development in rural areas. In this case, however, the site is not within the development limits and this policy does not apply.

The village settlement boundaries are currently under review. This site, known as Policy G83.1 has been put forward for consideration as part of the 'Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Pre-Submission Document' in connection with the LDF review of settlement boundaries.

In response to the consideration of incorporating the site into the settlement boundary and allowing future development, Site G83.1 is supported and listed as the only site allocation for the village. A draft policy G83.1 relates to this site. It states:

'Policy G83.1 Snettisham - Land south of Common Road and behind Teal Close Land amounting to 1.5 hectares, as shown on the Policies Map, is allocated for residential development of 34 dwellings. Development will be subject to compliance with all of the following:

1. Provision of safe vehicular and pedestrian access connecting the site to Common Road;
2. Submission of details of sustainable drainage measures and how they will integrate with the design of the development and how they will contribute to the amenity and biodiversity of the development. A suitable plan for the future management and maintenance of the SUDS should be included with the submission;
3. Provision of affordable housing in line with current standards;
4. Submission of a Heritage Asset Statement that establishes that there will be no negative impact on Heritage Assets in the locality, accompanied by an Archaeological Field Evaluation of the site;
5. Submission of details showing how the sewer crossing the site can be accommodated within the development (including any easements/diversions) to the satisfaction of Anglian Water;
6. Enhanced informal recreational provision on, or in the vicinity of the allocated site to limit the likelihood of additional recreational pressure (particularly in relation to exercising dogs) on Habitats Regulations protected nature conservation sites in the wider area.
1. This provision may consist of some combination of informal open space (over and above the Council's normal standards for play space)
 - pedestrian routes which provide a variety of terrain, routes and links to greenspace and/or the wider footpath network;
 - a contribution to greenspace provision or management in the wider area within which the site is located.'

The justification for the site allocation is given as the following:-

'The site (submitted sites 189/549 and 1284) offers the opportunity for infill development as there is existing development to the south, west and east. The site is close to the villages' services and facilities and there is potential for safe walking/cycling access to the village centre from Common Road and Alma Road.

From the surrounding area the site is viewed against a semi-urban backdrop. The majority of views of the site are limited to the near distance from adjacent roads, properties and public rights of way. Medium and long distance views from the wider landscape are possible from across the field to the north. In these views the site is seen in the context of the existing village. The site is adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which abuts the north west boundary of the site opposite Common Road. It is not considered that development on the site would have an adverse impact on the AONB as it lies within existing development. Development of part of the site received support of a range of consultees, including the Parish Council, local highway authority, and Norfolk Coast (AONB) Partnership.

The site is currently a greenfield site (agricultural grade 3/4) mainly used for pasture and grazing, with a hedgerow along the Common Road frontage. Whilst new housing would result in the loss of undeveloped land, there are no currently available opportunities to utilise previously developed land for new housing in Snettisham. Apart from the hedgerows there are no other landscape features of importance within the site boundary. There is a power line over part of the site which would be a design consideration.

A number of Medieval and Post-Medieval archaeological finds have been identified immediately west, south and east of the site including drainage and boundary ditches and pits as well as evidence of a probable Roman track or road to the south of the site. Due to the potential for archaeological finds it is required that the site archaeology is further investigated prior to development.

The Internal Drainage Board for King's Lynn state that there is a need for careful surface water drainage design to avoid increasing the risk of flooding on drains south of Snettisham meaning a Sustainable Drainage System (SUDS) would be sought to serve new development.

The Habitats Assessment Report has identified a risk of indirect adverse effects on designated nature conservation sites from development in this location. In order to avoid any such effect particular measures need to be delivered with development, as set out in the Policy.'

It should be noted that the site allocation, G83.1 refers to a residential development of 34 dwellings. Amended plans for this current application on part of the allocation site have now reduced this figure to 23 units to allow for the remainder of the allocation to be constructed on land to the south. Access to this additional land could be through Common Road and provision has been made for a road access to the south by leaving the appropriate gap in the streetscene.

In summary, the site for the proposed development is currently outside the settlement boundary, where development is restricted. The site has been reviewed through the LDF process, is supported for residential development and has been found the most suitable location for the expansion of the village up to 2026. However, this is not yet adopted and the process is still on going.

The weight to be given to the emerging LDF/local plan prior to adoption is set out in the NPPF para 216. The weight given depends on the stage reached, the extent of unresolved objections, and the consistency with the NPPF. In principle, this application for planning permission needs to be considered in light of the matters referred to at para. 216 of the

NPPF in addition to the matters referred to in draft policy G83.1 as well as other practical and planning policy issues.

Impact upon the adjoining AONB

AONB's have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. In this case the application site is open land currently used as a paddock, outside but opposite the AONB.

The NPPF states nationally designated areas, such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), have been confirmed by the Government as having the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of the natural beauty of the landscape and countryside should therefore be given great weight in planning policies and development control decisions in these areas.

In this case the impact upon the AONB has already been considered as part of the site allocation exercise and is referred to above. In summary, the 'Pre-submission' document states that 'it is not considered that development on the site would have an adverse impact on the AONB as it appears as a gap between existing development to the east and west of the site, and would join these two areas.'

The Norfolk Coast Partnership has not commented on this current application but has previously raised no objection to proposed development on this site, stating this site is acceptable in principle and preferable to other proposed future housing sites in Snettisham within the AONB, subject to the development having a high standard of design and that the massing and materials have regard to its potential impact on the setting of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty so as to avoid significant impact.

In this case the applicant has submitted a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment which states that in respect of the Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) to the north of the site, the development within the application site will have no adverse effect on the views experienced from within the AONB. The application site will add an area of housing to the existing settlement. Development within the site would be seen in context of the existing residential settlement of Snettisham, which encompasses the proposed development to the south, east and west.

As the site is surrounded by residential development on three sides the proposed development will be seen from the AONB against a backdrop of buildings and will not be unduly conspicuous in context. It is not considered that this infill site will have a harmful impact on the wider character of this part of the AONB.

Design, character and appearance

The NPPF states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development is indivisible from good planning and should contribute positively to making places better for people (para. 56). 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 (para. 64).

Policy CS08 of the Core Strategy requires that new development be of a high quality design and that proposals should optimise the density of the development in light of factors such as the setting of the development, the form and character of existing development and the requirement for any on site infrastructure including amenity space.

Development Management Policies DM1, 2, 8, 15, 16, 17 are relevant.

The application has evolved since its original submission and amendments have been made to the layout following feedback from statutory consultees and officers. The layout now shows a total of 23 units which is two less than the original submission. This allows for an improved layout and space for an access through to the land to the south.

The site is roughly rectangular in shape and has a long road frontage with an established hedgerow. The eastern end of the site is longer than the western. There is a significant constraint to development on the site. To the eastern part of the site there is a gas pipeline which cannot be moved. The site layout therefore takes into account the easement relating to this gas pipe which prevents development across part of the site.

The site layout seeks to retain as much of the roadside hedgerow as possible although the required visibility splays mean that a significant amount will need to be removed for highway safety reasons to achieve the single point of access into the site. This will be replanted to retain the character of the streetscene and soften the frontage. The retention of hedgerow to the front of the site was encouraged for the social housing site on the opposite side of the road, Fishers End Close and helps to retain the rural characteristics of the site. The hedgerow at the back of the site is outside the application site boundary and not affected by the proposal.

Existing development along Common Road is a mixture of road frontage properties, cul-de-sac development and courtyard layouts. The layout incorporates road frontage properties facing Common Road and also short runs of terraced and semi-detached properties running north south.

The site provides public open space to the north western corner where a Local Area for Play (LAP) can be provided. The public open space is overlooked by units 15 – 19 so has surveillance from surrounding properties.

The emerging Policy G83.1 refers to the need to provide enhanced informal recreational provision on, or in the vicinity of the allocated site to limit the likelihood of additional recreational pressure (particularly in relation to exercising dogs) on Habitats Regulations protected nature conservation sites in the wider area. This provision may consist of some combination of informal open space (over and above the Council's normal standards for play space), pedestrian routes or a contribution to green space provision or management in the wider area.

Development Management Policy refers to the provision of open space for residential developments and refers to a standard of 2.4 hectares of open space per 1000 population on schemes of 20 units or more. This is based on the Field's in Trust's Planning and Design Standard. Using the methodology in the preamble to the policy, the whole of Site G83.1 would require a minimum of 0.19ha open space (based on 34 dwellings) on the 1.5ha site. Using this same calculation this proposed development of 23 dwellings on a 0.83ha site would require a minimum of 0.13ha recreational open space. Currently this proposal incorporates 0.04ha of public open space, although there are areas of open space throughout the development used as swales for drainage.

If, however, the policy requirements of providing over and above the Council's normal standard for play space was imposed on this site it would result in a significant proportion of the site left open. This would mean that to achieve the 23 units on the remainder of the site would result in a significantly denser scheme (33 dwellings per hectare), which would not be in keeping with development which flanks the site in terms of form and character (average between 16 – 28 dwellings per hectare). Alternatively, if a density was used which was compatible with adjoining development then a reduction in the number of units across the

site would be required to be between 11 – 19 units. This would then reduce the requirement for affordable housing units to between 2 – 4.

In this case therefore it is considered that the scheme as amended takes sufficient reference from the existing surrounding development to ensure that it is in harmony with the characteristics of the area. Providing more recreational space than offered in this case would have a significant impact on the layout.

In response to the policy requirement of G83.1 to limit additional recreational pressure on Habitats Regulations protected nature conservation sites in the wider area the applicant agrees that the site is too small to provide any meaningful provisions for recreational dog walkers which would not conflict with proposed play areas. The applicant states that, according to latest statistics, less than 1 in 4 households now have dogs. The applicant states that the proposal as submitted is therefore only likely to generate an additional 5 or 6 dog-owning households to the overall wider total of the settlement, which in itself is therefore likely to have very little impact in terms of the concerns of the Policy. They therefore suggest that the negligible additional impacts likely to arise as a result of future occupants of the proposed dwellings and their dogs should not warrant any further physical amendments to the proposal as submitted.

However, if Members feel this is an issue of concern, the applicant is willing to provide a small scale financial contribution via S106 to provide funding towards educational literature, etc. in this respect. A figure of around £50 per dwelling has been quoted by the applicant as a sum which has previously been sought elsewhere by LPA's to address similar concerns.

The Parks Operation Manager has raised no objection to the amount of open space provision although requested a more central position within the site due to its proximity to the road and a more central location would increase natural surveillance. However, the position of this open space is also connected to the drainage of the site and beneath it is proposed an underground retention basin for the surface water. Moving the position of the open space would therefore create new drainage issues as the underground retention basin could not be positioned beneath residential properties. The position of the open space is the same location as the previous application which raised no objection from the Parks Operation Manager.

The Parks Operation Manager has stated that the Local Area for Play (LAP) should include one piece of play equipment. The details of this can be covered by planning condition. She has also requested landscape plans and landscape management details and these can be covered by planning condition.

The site is further restricted as there is a gas pipe easement running through the eastern end of the site. This does provide a constraint, which was previously identified as the weak point of the layout. Clearly the route of the gas pipe must be kept clear of buildings or structures and avoid significant ground disturbance so this is dedicated to roads, parking and turning. By avoiding this route means that developable space to the north eastern corner of the site is limited and the properties and the associated garden land of Units 7 - 9 to the south eastern corner have private gardens of irregular shape.

The gas pipe constraint also means that the parking arrangements for properties at the eastern end of the site are laid out differently. Some of the parking spaces are more remote from the properties they serve than would normally be expected. For example, the parking space to units 1 – 4 and 8 and 9 are not immediately adjacent to the properties. This is purely to avoid the easement, but is an improvement on the previous scheme where distances between parking spaces and properties were greater and parking spaces appeared quite isolated.

Another feature of the scheme which your officers previously raised concern was the design of Units 1 – 3 along the main frontage facing Common Road. This run of terraced units showed a mixed design of units which did not relate well to each other or the area in general. Your officers requested that this be amended in favour of a simpler design and the applicant has revised this to produce a more traditional run of cottage style dwellings. Units 1 – 3 have carstone frontages and Unit 1 also has a carstone gable. This reflects the building material found locally and used in the surrounding recent developments at Roosters Close and Fishers End Close.

The applicant has also made changes to improve the design across the site so that the dwellings feature more cottage style elements and is less urban and takes better reference from dwellings found within Snettisham. The garage sizes now meet the required standards.

The application makes reference to the use of local building materials, namely red brick, carstone and pantile roofs. If permission is forthcoming, however, the details would need to be covered by planning condition.

The proposed layout gives opportunity for landscaping and planting. The use of swales for SUDS means that a significant degree of landscaping would be retained throughout the site.

The applicant scores the scheme 11 out of 12 green points with one amber point for 'car parking', recognising the limitations of courtyard parking areas.

In summary it is acknowledged that the site has a physical constraint in the form of a gas pipe easement which determines the position and layout of development. It is also noted that the requirement of Policy G83.1 to provide recreational space over and above the general open space requirements cannot be met without significant implications for the layout, density or number of units on the site. It is considered that the proposed development will not harm the character and quality of the area and the way it functions. It is considered to be sufficiently in keeping in terms of form and character to accord with the provisions of the NPPF and Policies CS08 of the Core Strategy and Policy 4/21 of the Local Plan.

Impact upon Residential Amenity

There are existing residential properties to the east, south east and west. The key areas for the consideration of the impact upon the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties are issues of overlooking, overshadowing and whether or not the dwellings will be over bearing.

Properties to the east of the site within Roosters Close back onto the site. The properties closest to the eastern boundary also back onto the adjoining site but are set at an angle. The distances between the existing and proposed properties are such that there are no concerns regarding overlooking, overshadowing or the proposed new units being overbearing.

Properties to the west of the site along Common Road back onto the site with short rear gardens. The part of the site closest to these dwellings is shown to be used for public open space. There are windows to the rear of these properties and a wire fence between the dwellings and the application site. There are no concerns regarding overlooking or any part of the proposed dwellings causing overshadowing in this case.

The adjoining open space is approximately 430m² and not of sufficient size to play formal team games or hold large numbers of people at any one time. There may be general noise from this proposed open space, which will see play equipment introduced, but it is not

expected that noise levels will be so significant to raise noise nuisance issues. The CSNN Team has not raised an objection to the siting of this informal open space.

Properties to the south west of the site on Willowmead Close have gardens closest to the application site. However, these are separated by neighbouring garden land. Third party objection has been received regarding overlooking of these properties and gardens by the occupants of Units 15 and 16 whose rear windows face this direction. However, there is more than 20m between the windows of these proposed properties and the garden boundary of the properties in Willowmead Close. Consequently the distances between properties is such that there are no significant concerns regarding overlooking in this case. Concerns regarding general noise and disturbance from the development for residents in Willowmead Close are noted, but again, given the 20m separation distance they will not be directly affected. The noises will be those associated with a general domestic use and this is compatible with existing surrounding uses.

To the south of the site is open arable land. To the south east are bungalows on Goose Green Road. Due to the orientation of the site the proposed development will not cause overshadowing to these properties and the distances between properties is such that there are no concerns regarding overlooking or the proposed new units being overbearing.

Affordable housing

The site is of a size where it needs to provide affordable housing in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS09. It is also referred to in Policy G83.1.

The Applicant proposes 5 affordable units in accordance with the policy (i.e. 20% of 23 units), constructed and transferred to an approved RSL. Two of the five affordable units are shown to be shared ownership housing. These will be one 3 bedroom unit and one 2 bedroom unit. The remaining three dwellings will be for rented accommodation. These will be two 2 bedroom units and one 1 bedroom house.

The number, mix and tenure split of the affordable units and positioning across the site accords with the Council's policy and this element has the agreement of the Housing Strategy Officer.

The Housing Strategy Officer raised concerns to the previous application regarding the grouping of all of the affordable units in one part of the site and requested they be pepper potted across the site. The Council's Affordable Housing Policy states that for a development of this size the maximum affordable cluster size should be 4 dwellings to avoid large concentrations of single tenure dwellings and to achieve mixed and sustainable communities.

This current application shows a terraced run of 4 affordable dwellings and then a separate, detached, affordable dwelling set immediately to the west of this terrace. The Housing Strategy Officer notes that the locations of the affordable units have been revised and the affordable units are now pepper potted in line with the Council's Affordable Housing Policy. Therefore the Housing Strategy Officer now supports both the affordable housing locations and mix.

The delivery of the affordable housing is the subject of negotiation through the S106 legal agreement.

Highway Issues

The layout has been developed following ongoing discussion with the Highways Authority. They raise no objection to the scheme subject to the widening of the road across the front of the site and the provision of adequate visibility splays. This would entail removing most of the hedge along the front of the site but adequate space would remain for a hedge to be replanted behind the required visibility splay so that it does not interfere with highway safety.

Consequently the County Council raises no objection to the scheme subject to conditions regarding detailed plans of the road/footway/cycleway details, foul and surface water drainage, provision of parking and turning facilities, visibility splays, construction worker parking, facilities and details of off-site highway improvement works.

Third party concerns have been made regarding additional traffic using Common Road creating additional inconvenience, noise and disturbance. However, it is not considered that the additional traffic associated with the scale of this development would have such a significantly detrimental impact on neighbour amenity to warrant the refusal of planning permission.

Drainage

The site is located in Flood Zone 1 (low risk). A Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted in support of the planning application.

Policy G83.1 requires the 'submission of details of sustainable drainage measures and how they will integrate with the design of the development and how they will contribute to the amenity and biodiversity of the development. A suitable plan for the future management and maintenance of the SUDS should be included with the submission'.

The Parish Council and local residents have raised concerns regarding drainage issues affecting this part of the village as this part of the village has historically witnessed localised flooding.

However, since the original submission further discussion has taken place between the applicant's engineers and Anglian Water and a revised FRA has been produced. Anglian Water have confirmed acceptance of the proposed drainage scheme. The EA has also accepted the scheme and CSNN are also satisfied with the revised details.

Foul water is proposed to feed into the existing drainage system, for which there is capacity, and surface water is proposed to be disposed of through a sustainable drainage system. Plans and details have been provided showing that in private areas hardstandings will be constructed of permeable pavements, allowing cleaning and percolation of surface water to take place.

Swales are also used as part of the SUDS and the plans show that there will be around 170m of swale on the site to infiltrate and convey the surface water. A retention basin is also used and, combined with the swales, it has been shown that there is sufficient storage on the site to contain the maximum storm event without flooding outside these features.

Whilst the EA and Anglian Water raise no objection in principle, the implementation of the foul and surface water drainage needs to be agreed via condition.

Crime and Disorder

Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 requires Local Authorities to consider the implications for crime and disorder in the carrying out of their duties. The NPPF also requires that decisions should aim to achieve places which promote safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion.

Initial comments received from the Police Architectural Officer raised objection to the lack of natural surveillance over the parking courtyards to the eastern part of the site and the pedestrian link to the north eastern corner through to the parking court where there are low levels of surveillance.

The agent has subsequently made changes to the scheme with Secure by Design in mind, to improve surveillance and create private access areas. The pedestrian entrance in the north eastern corner onto Common Road is now shown to be gated to discourage free access into the site, access gates have been repositioned closer to car parking spaces, fenestration improved and a change to the design of the fencing allows better views over the parking areas. The Police Architectural Officer has since agreed these changes and has removed his objection to the earlier scheme.

Archaeology

Since the original submission of the application an Archaeological Evaluation has been undertaken on the site, involving trenching. The consultants revealed that nothing of great interest was found and the results reported to the Historic Environment Service.

The Historic Environment Service has confirmed that following the Archaeological Evaluation no further archaeological works will be required at the site. Accordingly no further works are required and no planning conditions are necessary. The proposal accords with the provisions of paragraph 128 of the NPPF.

Ecology

The site is an open, grassed paddock.

A Habitat Survey has been submitted in support of the application. No protected species were encountered but further survey work is recommended for reptiles and bats. Consequently, a bat activity report and a reptile survey have been produced.

The bat report reinforced the conclusions of the Habitat Survey and identified 17 bats of 4 different species over two surveys. The Bats were observed or their calls recorded and the results indicate the site being used for foraging and commuting. Due to the level of activity observed, however, the site is considered to be of local importance to a small number of species. That said, conditions relating to lighting and landscaping are recommended.

No reptiles were found during the survey effort and they are therefore considered to be absent from the site. Consequently there are no constraints regarding reptiles and no mitigation measures are required in this case.

Conditionally it is considered that the development complies with the NPPF and Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy.

Contamination

The applicant has submitted a geotechnical desk study report. The Environmental Health Officer is happy with the information provided and has no comments to make regarding contaminated land or air quality issues.

Lighting scheme

The application has been supported by details of the proposed external lighting scheme. This will generally be guided by the requirements of the Highway Authority, but reference has been made to avoiding overspill and low lux lighting to prevent excessive levels of light which might result in negative ecological impacts. The final details, however, need to be agreed via planning condition.

Other material considerations

Norfolk County Council has responded with regard to county contributions. Infrastructure provision and commuted sums are to be covered by the S106 agreement towards library books and open space/play equipment and implementation/delivery. Fire hydrants can be secured by condition. NCC confirms that no education contributions are required for this site.

The Arboricultural Officer has raised no objection to the proposal subject to a full landscaping scheme to include species, locations and planting densities, enhancement of the existing hedge along the southern boundary of the site and incorporation of some native species trees throughout the development. Although the hedge to the south of the site is important in habitat terms and also to provide screening and soften this boundary, it is outside the application site boundary and cannot be controlled by planning condition. Planting and landscaping within the site, however, can be conditioned.

Third party concerns raised several issues. Most of these related to localised flooding issues, matters of drainage and capacity of sewers. These issues have already been addressed within this report. Other issues relating to design, impact on the local highway and too much development in this part of the village are also covered earlier in this report. Also concerns about impact of noise from the play area are referred to above.

CONCLUSION

The site itself is outside the current development limit of the village and is shown as countryside on the 1998 Local Plan Adopted Proposals Map. In policy terms such an application for residential development in the countryside would normally be refused planning permission. However, in this case the site is the Council's preferred option for housing as identified through Policy G83.1 in the Site Allocation Pre-Submission Document.

The site is currently used as a paddock but is bordered by development on three sides and is therefore viewed in large measure against a semi-urban backdrop. The natural topography of the site, being relatively level, helps to lessen the impact of development on the surrounding area therefore limits the impact on the visual amenity of the adjoining Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

The scheme, as amended, has successfully overcome the previously identified weak points within the design and layout which were referred to in the reasons for refusal of application 13/01736/FM. The affordable housing units have been pepper potted in a way which now meets council policy and the layout has improved with regard to Secured by Design issues.

It is considered that the resulting proposed development will not harm the character and quality of the area and the way it functions. It is considered to be sufficiently in keeping in terms of form and character to accord with the provisions of the NPPF and Policies CS08 of the Core Strategy and Policy 4/21 of the Local Plan. Whilst it is noted that the requirement of Policy G83.1 to provide recreational space over and above the general open space requirements cannot be met without significant implications for the layout, density or number of units on the site, the proposal does accord with the remaining criteria listed in the policy.

Conditionally the proposed development is acceptable in terms of highways, affordable housing, residential amenity, ecology and crime and disorder.

The method of dealing with the surface water drainage and issues relating to flood risk appear to have been resolved but the final design of the foul and surface water drainage will need to be agreed by planning condition.

The provision of affordable housing and public open space will all be controlled by S106 legal agreement, as will the need to contribute towards libraries.

Although premature to the adoption of the emerging LDF/local plan site allocation for the period up to 2026, given the general consistency with draft policy G83.1 and the NPPF, it is considered appropriate to determine the application in line with the provisions of paragraph 216 of the NPPF.

On this basis, it is recommended for approval subject to conditions as well as the satisfactory conclusion of the S106 agreement.

RECOMMENDATION:

A) APPROVE subject to conditions and completion of Section 106 Agreement.

- 1 Condition The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
- 1 Reason To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, 2004.
- 2 Condition The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Drawing No. SNE1-1000, Site Location Plan

Drawing No. SNE1-1001, Rev D, Planning Layout

Drawing No. SNE1-1002, Rev D, External Works Layout

Drawing No. SNE1-1004, Rev A, Materials Plan

Drawing No. SNE1-1005, Rev B, Proposed Floor Plans & Elevations (Plots 7, 8, 9 & 13)

Drawing No. SNE1-1006, Rev A, Proposed Floor Plans & Elevations (Plots 1,2,3,4 & 10)

Drawing No. SNE1-1007, Rev B, Proposed Floor Plans & Elevations (Plots 20, 21, 22 & 23)

Drawing No. SNE1-1008, Rev B, Proposed Floor Plans & Elevations (Plots 5, 6-11)

Drawing No. SNE1-1009, Rev B, Proposed Floor Plans & Elevations (Plot 12)

Drawing No. SNE1-1010, Rev B, Proposed Floor Plans & Elevations (Plots 14-15)

Drawing No. SNE1-1011, Rev B, Proposed Floor Plans & Elevations (Plots 16, 17, 18 & 19)

- 2 Reason For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
- 3 Condition Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, 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 the 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 approved scheme and thereafter maintained and retained as agreed.
- 3 Reason In the interests of minimising light pollution to safeguard the amenities of the locality and to minimise the impact of the development upon protected species in accordance with the NPPF.
- 4 Condition Prior to the first use or occupation of the development hereby approved, full details of both hard and soft landscape works shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include finished levels or contours, hard surface materials, refuse or other storage units, street furniture, structures and other minor artefacts. Soft landscape works shall include planting plans, written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment) schedules of plants noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers and densities where appropriate.
- 4 Reason To ensure that the development is properly landscaped in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with the NPPF.
- 5 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.
- 5 Reason To ensure that the work is carried out within a reasonable period in accordance with the NPPF.
- 6 Condition No existing trees, shrubs or hedges within the site that are shown as being retained on the approved plans shall be felled, uprooted, willfully damaged or destroyed, cut back in any way or removed without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority. Any trees, shrubs or hedges removed without such approval or that die or become severely damaged or seriously diseased within 5 years from the completion of the development hereby permitted shall be replaced with trees, shrubs or hedge plants of a similar size and species in the next available planting season, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written approval to any variation.
- 6 Reason To ensure that the development is compatible with the amenities of the locality and to minimise the impact of the development upon protected species in accordance with the NPPF.

- 7 Condition The development shall not be brought into use until a scheme for the provision of a fire hydrant has been implemented in accordance with a scheme that has previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 7 Reason In order to ensure that water supplies are available in the event of an emergency in accordance with the NPPF.
- 8 Condition No works shall commence on the site until such time as detailed plans of the roads, footways, cycleways, foul and surface water drainage have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. All construction works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
- 8 Reason To ensure satisfactory development of the site and a satisfactory standard of highway design and construction
- 9 Condition No works shall be carried out on roads, footways, cycleways, foul and surface water sewers otherwise than in accordance with the specifications of the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.
- 9 Reason To ensure satisfactory development of the site and to ensure estate roads are constructed to a standard suitable for adoption as public highway
- 10 Condition Before any dwelling is first occupied the road(s), footway(s) and cycleway(s) shall be constructed to binder course surfacing level from the dwelling to the adjoining County road in accordance with the details to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.
- 10 Reason To ensure satisfactory development of the site.
- 11 Condition Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted a visibility splay measuring 2.4m x 59m shall be provided to each side of the access where it meets Common Road and such splays shall thereafter be maintained at all times free from any obstruction exceeding 0.225 metres above the level of the adjacent highway carriageway.
- 11 Reason In the interests of highway safety
- 12 Condition The applicant has submitted details of the foul and surface water drainage arrangements for the site within the Flood Risk Assessment, Revision B, dated April 2014. The drainage details shall be constructed as approved before any part of the development hereby permitted is brought into use.
- 12 Reason To ensure that there is a satisfactory means of drainage in accordance with the NPPF.
- 13 Condition Notwithstanding the details indicated on the submitted drawings no works shall commence on site until full details of off-site highway improvement works to comprise of widening of the site frontage carriageway to 5.5m and a 1.8m wide site frontage footway has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

- 13 Reason To ensure that the highway improvement works are designed to an appropriate standard in the interest of highway safety and to protect the environment of the local highway corridor.
- 14 Condition Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted the off-site highway improvement works referred to in condition 14 shall be completed to the written satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.
- 14 Reason To ensure that the highway network is adequate to cater for the development proposed
- 15 Condition Notwithstanding the details that accompanied the application hereby permitted, no development shall take place on any external surface of the development until the type, colour and texture of all materials to be used for the external surfaces of the building(s) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 15 Reason To ensure a satisfactory external appearance and grouping of materials in accordance with the principles of the NPPF.
- 16 Condition No development shall commence on any external surface of the development until a sample panel of the materials to be used for the external surfaces of the building(s) and/or extension(s) hereby permitted has been erected on the site for the inspection and written approval of the Local Planning Authority. The sample panel shall measure at least 1 metre x 1 metre using the proposed materials, mortar type, bond and pointing technique. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.
- 16 Reason To ensure a satisfactory external appearance and grouping of materials in accordance with the principles of the NPPF.
- 17 Condition A landscape management plan including long-term design objectives, management responsibilities, management and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas and swales, (other than small privately owned, domestic gardens), shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of any part of the buildings or any phase of the development, whichever is the sooner, for its permitted use. The landscape management plan shall be carried out as approved and retain in perpetuity.
- 17 Reason To ensure that the landscaping is properly maintained in accordance with the NPPF.
- 18 Condition Notwithstanding the details shown on Drawing No. 1001 Rev D details of the hardstanding surfacing between the hammerhead junction and the southern site boundary to serve the road access link to the adjoining land to the south shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of the development. This hard surfaced area shall be constructed and made freely available for use by pedestrian and vehicular traffic no later than the commencement of the 20th dwelling on the site. Thereafter no dwelling shall be occupied until the said hard surfaced area has been completed to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

- 18 Reason To ensure the provision of a road to the southern part of the site so as to enable a link to be made through to the highway layout on the adjoining land for the proper planning of the area in accordance with the NPPF.

(B) In the event that the Section 106 agreement is not completed within 3 months of the date of this Committee meeting, the application shall be **REFUSED** due to the failure to secure affordable housing, public open space and county contributions.