

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

06 November 2023

### SUMMARY OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED SINCE THE PUBLICATION OF THE AGENDA AND ERRATA

Item No. 9/1(a) 22/01310/RMM Page No. 14

**Applicant: Submitted the following information:**

#### Trees and Landscape

We are confident that we are removing no more trees than were approved for removal at outline stage. Just as an example, two prominent areas identified for removal are W54 (next to Claylands) and W63 (next to Ullswater Avenue). In our submitted Arb Assessment, W54 is dominated by hawthorns (300 individuals), with the next most numerous species being ash (200 individuals). W63 is dominated by hawthorn (500 individuals). These numbers are of course only indicative as they have not been individually counted.

I would also emphasise that not all of W63 and W54 are being removed. Large areas around the ponds and the buffer separating these parcels from the main development parcel are in fact being kept. However, we have not separated these numbers out in our assessment. It is not accurate to say (for example) that all of W54 (950 individual trees) is being lost, when probably 20% of W54 will remain as part of the central woodland belt.

The outline Landscape Strategy showed indicative tree removals. As the comparisons below demonstrate:

- We are proposing to retain trees around the north and west of the parcel that were previously shown for removal
- We are proposing to retain a large tree belt between the two ponds which was previously shown for removal, which connects with our Green Link
- We are retaining a much greater proportion of trees south of the link with Ullswater Avenue, either side of our proposed houses

All that being said, we concede that we have dwellings encroaching into the landscape buffer shown on the outline Land Use Plan. As we have previously discussed with the LPA, it was decided against providing significant planting within domestic curtilages due to the lack of certainty over their long-term maintenance. We would ask the authority to weigh this up in the planning balance.

We have also been looking in more detail at what we are proposing. I can confirm that in terms of numbers, we are looking at:

- Proposed individual trees within public open space: 647
- Proposed individual on-plot trees: 190
- Proposed native woodland planting: 1,112 sqm (comprising of 311 individual whips/transplants/plants)
- Proposed native shrub planting: 2,992 sqm (comprising of 3083 individual whips/transplants/plants)
- Proposed native mixed hedgerows: 1,082.5 Linear metres (comprising of 7227 individual whips/transplants/plants)

We therefore believe that the trees/hedgerows being lost are more than compensated by the new species being planted, which are provided across the site and will all be managed in a much more effective way to enhance both public amenity and biodiversity value.

### Brochure

A brochure was circulated to members of the committee from the applicant. It should be noted that the final comment in the brochure appears to quote the officer. However, it should be noted that this quote is a quote from the applicant's own Supporting Statement contained within the officer's report.

### Affordable housing

An error has been identified on the affordable housing plans which has been corrected by the submission of the following amended plans:

100-831-011 X Affordable Housing Plan  
100-831-013AE General Masterplan  
100-831-42F Housing Mix Plan

### **Amendments: Three amended conditions are proposed**

#### Condition 16:

Condition 16 should be amended to begin with the phrase **Notwithstanding the approved plans...**

Condition 16 Notwithstanding the approved plans, prior to the first occupation of any dwelling in each phase of the development hereby permitted, full details of both hard and soft landscape works for that phase shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include, but not be limited to:

- I. Hard landscape works: finished levels or contours, hard surface materials, refuse or other storage units, street furniture, structures and other minor artefacts, boundary types, and any paved surfaces (including manufacturer, type, colour and size) underground modular systems, and sustainable urban drainage integration (see detailed design proposals for street trees planting pits/trenches at II)
- II. Soft landscape works: planting plans (which show the relationship to all underground services overhead lighting and the drainage layout), written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plan and grass establishment), schedules of plants noting species, plant sizes, proposed numbers and densities, tree planting details including method of staking, and irrigations, detailed design proposals for street trees planting pits/trenches including, but not limited to, locations, soil volumes in cubic metres, cross sections and dimensions.

All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of any dwelling in that phase 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.

Condition 26:

As part of the full detailed plans of the roads, footways, cycleways, highway landscaping, public transport infrastructure, and foul and surface water drainage thereof contained within Condition 4 of this permission, the plans shall include full details of bus stops, to allow for the potential use of public transport within the wider site. of this permission, the plans shall include full details of bus stops, to allow for the potential use of public transport within the wider site. These details shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority for each phase of the development hereby permitted. All construction works shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of any dwelling in that phase.

Affordable Housing:

The affordable housing mix has been slightly amended to correct an error identified on the submitted plans:

Originally approved mix (as outlined on pages 19 and 20 of the committee report)

- 18 x 1 beds – 14 maisonettes and 4 bungalows all for rent
- 44 x 2 beds - 32 x houses (14 for shared ownership and 18 for rent) ,4 x maisonettes (for rent), 8 x 2 bed bungalows (6 for rent and 2 for shared ownership)
- 38 x 3 beds - 32 x houses (16 for shared ownership and 16 for rent) 6 x bungalows
- 8 x 4 beds all for rent

Amended mix:

- 20 x 1 beds – 14 maisonettes and 6 bungalows (2 x Guelder bungalows M4(3) 4 x Oakley bungalows MR(2) all for rent)
- 42 x 2 beds - 32 x houses (16 for shared ownership and 16 for rent), 4 x maisonettes (for rent), 6 x 2 bed bungalows for rent (all M4(2))
- 38 x 3 beds - 32 x houses (16 for shared ownership and 16 for rent) 6 x bungalows for rent (all M4(2))
- 8 x 4 beds all for rent

This results in the following amended plans:

100-831-011 X Affordable Housing Plan  
100-831-013AE General Masterplan  
100-831-42F Housing Mix Plan

This also changes the overall housing mix, as outlined of page 19 of the committee report, from:

- 18 x 1-bed units
- 65 x 2-bed units
- 282 x 3-bed units
- 209 x 4-bed units.

To:

- 20 x 1-bed units
- 63 x 2-bed units
- 282 x 3-bed units
- 209 x 4-bed units.

Condition 1 will therefore be amended to delete

100-831-011 W Affordable Housing Plan  
100-831-013AD General Masterplan  
100-831-42E Housing Mix Plan

and **replace** with the following amended plans:

**100-831-011 X Affordable Housing Plan**  
**100-831-013AE General Masterplan**  
**100-831-42F Housing Mix Plan**

## Corrections

### Typographical errors

There is a typographical error on page 44 that is repeated on page 45.

The penultimate paragraph on page 44, and first paragraph on page 45 incorrectly states that access is a reserved matter, this should say appearance. To clarify, the penultimate paragraph on page 44 should read:

*This application is therefore for the determination of the outstanding reserved matters: layout, scale, appearance and landscaping.*

And the first paragraph on page 45 should read:

*Policy E4.1 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan relates specifically to the development of this site. Several policy requirements relate specifically to the outline consent (i.e., do not relate to layout, scale, appearance and landscaping.)*

### Amended Recommendation

To enable securement of the GIRAMS payment that is required to mitigate this reserved matters permission ***the recommendation on pages 18 and 63 & 77 should be changed to read:***

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

- A. APPROVE** subject to the completion of the Deed of Variation within four months of the date of this resolution to approve and the following conditions:
- B. REFUSE** if the Deed of Variation is not completed within four months of the date of this resolution to approve.

**Assistant Director's comments:**

The additional information is noted and clarification on the number of replacement trees is welcomed. However, it does not change the overall assessment, which is that the proposed development, in terms of the impacts on tree, including the loss of trees, is considered acceptable and that the Local Planning Authority's Arboricultural Officer raises no objection subject to a comprehensive suite of tree protection, replanting, maintenance and landscaping conditions.

It should however be noted that paragraph 4 is not considered to be an accurate reflection of discussions with the LPA in relation to the landscape buffer. The LPA considered that the buffer, rather than being a separate strip the maintenance of which would be questionable, should be incorporated into the cartilages of dwellings in that location. The LPA did not agree to any built form within the buffer.

Notwithstanding this, the landscaping condition requested by the Arboricultural Officer mentioned above suitably enables further consideration of this aspect if necessary.

In relation to the amendment to the affordable housing mix, it has been confirmed by the Housing Team that there is a need for fully wheelchair accessible bungalows m4(3) and that they are therefore content for them to be provided as affordable housing; however, they need to be for rent instead of shared ownership. The Housing Team is content to take an additional 2 x 2-bed houses for shared ownership.

The amendments to Condition 16, and the Recommendation are more precise. The change to condition 16 ensures that landscaping details can be amended notwithstanding other satisfactory elements of the approved plans, and the change to the recommendation ensures that the GIRAMS payment required can be secured before the decision is issued.

With regards public transport, which has been raised as an issue through the consultation process, a separate meeting has recently taken place between the Parish Councils, the developers, and the County Council as to how the £500,000 contribution towards the bus service will be spent, given that there is some flexibility within the S.106 (the S.106 clauses are attached to the main report for information). There is strong feeling from the Parish Councils that the bus service contribution should go towards a bus service that goes into the wider site, rather than just serving Grimston Road. Their view is that this is direct mitigation agreed through the outline planning permission, to offset highway impacts.

In this regard, a condition is proposed to replace existing condition 26, as it is sensible that the bus stop infrastructure is put in when the roads are constructed, to help promote the use of public transport, which was seen as important at the outline stage. This can be attached to this reserved matters, because it relates to site layout.

With regards the specifics of a bus route, this cannot be conditioned because it is not related to physical layout, and it is already covered as part of the S.106 agreement. How the contribution is spent, will be a matter for future detailed discussion between the Borough, County and Parish Councils, albeit the final decision will be made by the County Council. In that regard for information it is proposed that liaison meetings be set up with the Parish Councils going forward, to discuss the Knights Hill site and ongoing issues.

Notwithstanding the above, it is understood that the committee may want to express a view on the utilisation of the bus service contribution, given the strength of feeling on the issue from the parish councils.

Condition 26 should therefore be amended (as set out above) to reflect the above comments.

**Item No. 9/1(b) 23/00086/F**

**Page No. 182**

Councillors forwarded communication from Barratt Homes regarding the temporary access and conditions following discussion with the Parish Councils.

**Assistant Director's comments:**

This correspondence from Barratt Homes consists of supporting information, much of which is included within their supporting statement submitted within the officer report for this application. It has also been uploaded to the online file for transparency.

**Item No. 9/1(c) 22/01657/OM**

**Page No. 202**

**Outwell Parish Council:** Unfortunately Council has no representative to attend the DCB meeting on Monday 6th November.

Borough Councillor Chris Crofts is our representative.

With reference to application number 22/01657/OM, Outwell Parish Council still sticks to their opposition to this application due to the following reasons:

- 1). This will put more pressure on the local infrastructure that appears to be under increased pressure - the roads, local surgery and pharmacy, Secondary Schools.
- 2). The land is agriculture and Borough and Council's view is that no more houses to be built on areas not in the building area.
- 3). Access to this development will increase on a minor road that currently houses mainly a retired population.
- 4). There is already permission for 50 more affordable housing on a site in Isle Road, Outwell, why should Outwell have to take the majority of affordable housing for the County? There has been 15 properties already built in the village for this purpose, plus those on a development currently on Wisbech Road.

When the homes were built in this area previously - Slaley Homes paid Borough Council £250,000.00 for the building of Affordable Housing in another area of the village that Hastoe Housing have erected. Council are sure that this is not a suitable area for this type of development.

Please will you make it aware at the meeting that these are strong views from not just the Council but the residents in Whetstone Way too.

**Update:** At Page No. 212 it states as follows:

*Surface Water drainage:* The application is accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment and SW drainage strategy which promotes a SUDS scheme. The details of this and its future maintenance may be secured via Section 106 agreement.

However, as agreed with the applicants, the matter is to be covered via pre-commencement condition (i.e., Condition 21 at Page No. 219).

**Correction:** In light of the above, reference to SUDS should be removed from Recommendation A) at Page Nos. 205 & 214 to read as follows:

**A) APPROVE subject to the completion of a Section 106 agreement to secure tenure of dwellings, Public Open Space provision and maintenance and payment of GIRAMS fee within 4 months of this resolution to approve.**