

## Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 8 March 2016

Site visit made on 10 March 2016

**by D J Board BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI**

**Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 30 June 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/J3530/W/15/3129322**

**Land at Bentries Farm and Easton CP School, The Street, Easton, Woodbridge, IP13 0EB**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Hopkins and Moore against the decision of Suffolk Coastal District Council.
  - The application Ref DC/14/2244/FUL, dated 4 July 2014, was refused by notice dated 19 February 2015.
  - The development proposed is provision of 10 open market dwellings and 4 affordable dwellings, together with garages access road, parking, school car park and drop off zone, extension to school grounds, footpath, fencing, walling, landscaping, drainage infrastructure and other ancillary works.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for provision of 10 open market dwellings and 4 affordable dwellings, together with garages access road, parking, school car park and drop off zone, extension to school grounds, footpath, fencing, walling, landscaping, drainage infrastructure and other ancillary works at Land at Bentries Farm and Easton CP School, The Street, Easton, Woodbridge, IP13 0EB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/14/2244/FUL, dated 4 July 2014, subject to the conditions in Annex A.

### Application for costs

2. At the Hearing an application for costs was made by Hopkins and Moore against Suffolk Coastal District Council. This application will be the subject of a separate Decision.

### Preliminary Matters

3. The terrace of cottages to the east of the site known as Lowbarn Cottages was previously Verandah Cottages. I have used the latter in my decision.

### Background and Main Issues

4. The Council has adopted its Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and it came into effect in July 2015. In addition the appellant has provided a signed and dated unilateral undertaking to secure affordable housing and the provision of additional land for car parking at the school. In light of this the Council has confirmed it is not pursuing its second reason for refusal. The appeal is considered on this basis.
-

5. There is agreement that the surfaced school car park area lies within the Easton Conservation Area (CA). The remainder of the site lies outside of but adjacent to the CA.
6. Accordingly the main issues are:
  - Whether this would be a suitable site for housing;
  - The effect of the dwellings on the character and appearance of the area, having regard to their location adjacent to the Easton Conservation Area;
  - The effect of the proposal on the setting of Verandah Cottages, a Grade II Listed Building.

## **Reasons**

*Whether the site would be suitable for housing?*

*Housing land supply*

7. Paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) requires local planning authorities to identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5% or 20% if there has been a record of persistent under delivery.
8. The Council's position set out in its Housing Land Supply Assessment published in June 2015 (HLSA) is that it has a 5.12 years supply based on a housing requirement of 7900. The appellants consider that 7900 is not the correct figure to work from.
9. However, policy SP2 of the Core Strategy (CS), which sets out that provision will be made for '*...at least 7900 new homes across the district in the period 2010 to 2027...*' The examining inspector in his report identified that '*On the available evidence at this point the 11,000 new dwellings should be taken as the full objectively assessed housing need (OAN) for the district between 2010 and 2027*'. To avoid a delay in adopting the document the Council promoted the CS on the basis of the provision of 7900 dwellings. At this hearing there was no dispute that this figure is not an OAN. The difference in approach being whether it is the appropriate figure to base consideration of housing land supply.
10. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) is clear that housing requirement figures in an up to date local plan should be used as the starting point for calculating the five year supply. In this case the Core Strategy is adopted. However, its adoption was on the premise of an 'early review' that has not yet been undertaken. Furthermore, CS policy SP2 expresses the housing requirement to be '*...at least 7900...*' indicating that even if the 7900 is met then there would be scope for additional dwellings. This would accord with the objective of the Framework to '*...boost significantly the supply of housing...*'. As such to not accept that the requirement of 7900 is out of date would be contrary to this clear objective in the Framework.
11. At the hearing the Council confirmed that work has commenced on establishing an OAN. This is being undertaken with three other Councils. However, I have no detailed information on this matter. In addition the appellant has pointed out that the Council made a commitment to review the housing requirement. The examining inspectors concluding remarks on this matter stated that '*...If*

*the Council wishes to achieve a fully plan-led approach to new development it will be in its interests to undertake the review, which could be a partial exercise, as quickly as possible...*' The appellant submits that the lack of the required 'early review' is significant and that it is enshrined within the document. In particular that the lack of progress on this requirement adds weight to the position that it is not correct to rely on the 7900 figure.

12. The other issue raised relates to supply. To be considered developable, Footnote 11 to the Framework requires each site to be available now, to offer a suitable location for development now, to have a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and that development of the site is viable. The HLSA identifies that site allocations are being consulted on with only one of the 'old' local plan allocations left to come forward. In particular the Council's supply figures to meet its identified requirement substantially rely upon the BT Adastral Park site. This is based on 425 dwellings anticipated to be completed on this site during the last three years of what the Council consider to be the relevant 5 year period. I was provided with an update from the promoters of this site at the hearing. This indicated the intention to make a further planning application for the site and an '*Anticipated Permission and Construction Timeline*'. The appellant considers reliance on this site on this basis to be optimistic given that planning permission is not in place. I agree that this does cast doubt upon the stated delivery timeframe.
13. The appellant has also raised the issue of the buffer. The Core Strategy examining inspector considered that a 5% buffer was appropriate. However, appendix A of the HLSA suggests that the annual requirement derived from the headline figure in CS Policy SP2 was not met in the first five years of the CS. However, at the hearing it was pointed out that the last two years have seen an improvement and the Council pointed out that pre 2008 delivery was good. Overall, the evidence provided indicates that the position has fluctuated. As such there is no clear evidence to justify the imposition of a 20% buffer.
14. CS Policy SP2 and the HLSA say that the figure of 7900 is a minimum requirement over the plan period which is considered together with the issues identified regarding supply. In addition it is likely that the actual housing requirements of the district are higher than the figure used. In this regard it is key for the 7900 to be taken as a minimum as it is expressed in the policy. Furthermore this should be the case given that the 'early review' is not complete and there are no additional allocations in place. Therefore, overall, whilst the Council may have 5.12 years supply against the requirement in the relatively recently adopted plan this is not the only consideration within this issue. The 7900 is a minimum and it is perfectly reasonable, in my view, to allow new housing on an additional site that is a suitable and sustainable location. In particular when, as in this case, the review of the plan is due, if not overdue, and the OAN may almost certainly increase as a result.

#### *Location*

15. The site would be located outside of the physical limits of the village but there was no dispute between Council and appellant that it would be 'sustainable' as Easton is identified as a 'Local Service Centre'. The *Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Local Plan Document Issues and Options Consultation Document December 2014* gives an indicative suggested housing allocation for Easton of 5-15 dwellings. However, the third parties present at the hearing

raised a number of issues regarding the level of public transport, access to broadband and the impact of the development on existing services.

16. There is no shop or medical service in the village. There is a school and public house and the site would be well related to the existing village in terms of access on foot or by bike to these facilities. A wider range of services would be available in Wickham Market which is a short car journey away. Therefore, whilst future residents would be reliant upon the use of a car for travelling beyond the village, many journeys need not necessarily be long.
17. There is no detailed evidence before me that would indicate that existing infrastructure and facilities in the village could not cope with additional households. The site is close to other housing and would not be an isolated development in the countryside. It would be as accessible to services as other dwellings in the settlement boundary. Easton is located within a rural district and it is a local service centre with some facilities. Overall the proposal would not be in conflict with CS policy SP19 which refers to the settlement hierarchy within the district; in particular how the scale of development appropriate to a particular location should be determined.

#### *Character and appearance*

18. Easton is located on rising ground on the north side of the valley of the River Deben. The site abuts the physical limits boundary of the village. Therefore it is within the countryside for the purposes of the application of planning policy.
19. Easton has a strong linear form that follows the line of the River Deben, but the village also has a clear nucleus centred on the former Easton Park, the green, church and pub. The Street is the main road through Easton and is fronted by properties. However, the village has evolved over time. In particular there are a number of areas within the village where there are groups of modern houses located to the rear of The Street. The overall experience when travelling through the village is varied, with a mix of views.
20. The site sits above The Street. As such it would be visible, being part of the 'valley side' identified by the Council. The site itself undulates but its boundary would not extend excessively beyond the furthest dwelling opposite. In addition it would not be deeper than the existing properties located on School Lane. In this regard, whilst it would extend development deeper than just the road frontage, overall it would not represent a significant outward extension of development into the open countryside. The wider area has a residential feel and appearance and in this context the development of this site would not appear out of place. The Council considers that the proposal would be a contrast to the linear development along The Street. However, there are points in the village where development is found to the rear of this road. As such I do not agree that dwellings on the site would be fundamentally out of character.
21. The visibility of the dwellings would be variable. They would be seen from Hatcheston Road, The Street and from some points on School Lane. The scale of the dwellings would be a mix of single, one and a half and two storey properties. This would be consistent with the existing dwellings in the wider locality. Therefore, whilst visible, for this reason they would not be unduly prominent. In addition the appellants have demonstrated that an appropriate palette of materials could be utilised and this approach would complement the

existing development which does vary in style and form but is generally unified by its traditional material palette. Furthermore, the layout would allow for the retention of existing trees and hedges and for them to be supplemented thereby lessening the impact of the new buildings.

22. The site is located within a Special Landscape Area (SLA) which is a local designation. The Landscape Character Assessment does not rule out the expansion of settlements. Rather it highlights that new development should be appropriately located, of an appropriate scale and style, and well integrated into the existing pattern of settlement and vegetation. In this regard, for the reasons given, I do not consider that a well designed and configured scheme would be in conflict with the SLA.
23. The area of the site within the CA would be used for car parking, a use that currently exists. As such the impact in terms of use would be neutral. Nevertheless, I appreciate that as it stands the site contributes to the approach to the CA when entering Easton. The Council has provided the Easton Conservation Area Appraisal Supplementary Planning Document (ECAA). This identifies the positive contribution that the school building makes to the CA and that the impression of entering a built up area is gradual. It also draws out 'important views', none of which include the appeal site.
24. The new dwellings would be located adjacent to the CA. They would be visible behind the existing boundary treatment and Verandah Cottages. The main view would be of the roofscapes. The new dwellings would be spaced out, would have space around them and be constructed from traditional materials. Whilst these dwellings would contrast with Verandah Cottages black and white materials, they would appear as a backdrop. Further, key views of the school building would remain and the impression of high banks and hedgerows when entering the village would remain. In addition the provision of the dwellings set back substantially from the road would not significantly impact on the approach to the nucleus of the village, with its gradual increase in built form.
25. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area, having regard to the location adjacent to the Easton Conservation Area. It would not be in conflict with policy SP15 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies, which amongst other things seeks to protect and enhance landscape character.

#### *Effect on the setting of Verandah Cottages*

26. S66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that, when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, special regard shall be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. The Framework defines the setting of a heritage asset as the surroundings in which the asset is experienced, pointing out that the extent of the setting may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve.
27. Verandah Cottages have a common boundary with the development site. They are described as likely to have been estate workers/farm labourer's cottages. It is suggested that the cottages were remodelled at some point in the 19<sup>th</sup> century with the addition of a verandah. The cottages are set back from the road and away from the common boundary with the appeal site. Generally the

cottages have space around them. I appreciate that the cottages sit comfortably within the village and have a strong architectural style. The materials and architectural quality are key features.

28. The Cottages are visible when entering Easton along The Street, in particular the roof form. The new dwellings would be visible behind the cottages from this view. Exiting the village along The Street the existing trees and hedgerow would serve to lessen the views of the cottages from this perspective. The plans indicate that a gap would remain between the appeal properties and the cottages. For these reasons from The Street and within the site views of the development and the cottages together would be limited.
29. The main change would be that some of the new buildings and their roof forms would be viewed in conjunction with the roofscape of the cottages. This would represent a change in the appreciation of the cottages, which at present are viewed within an open farmland/countryside setting. However, the new development would be well spaced and well designed. Furthermore the roof forms of the new dwellings would sit behind the cottages. In this regard they would appear in the background and would not diminish the prominence of the listed building. Overall, even when considered cumulatively, the elements that contribute to the setting of Verandah Cottages and its presence in the village would be impacted on but the degree of harm would be less than substantial.
30. Paragraph 134 of the Framework states that '*Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use*'. This matter is considered within the planning balance at paragraphs 45 and 46.

#### *Other matters*

31. Paragraphs 7 and 8 of the Framework require the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development to be considered together. The provision of new dwellings would provide employment during construction. Future residents would also be likely to make use of the existing services in the village. However, I appreciate that whilst there are some services in the village they are limited in number and type. Therefore there would be some economic benefits but these would be limited and in some cases temporary. The final dimension of sustainable development is the environmental role. I have considered the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and found that, overall, the provision of housing in this location would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. I therefore conclude that the site would be a suitable site for housing, having regard to the principles of sustainable development.
32. I have carefully considered the additional comments of local residents. In particular additional concerns have been raised regarding highway safety, floodrisk, the living conditions of existing occupiers and archaeology.
33. There is no substantive information to indicate that the development itself would lead to traffic problems or issues of highway safety. In addition the Local Highway Authority has not raised any issues regarding the design and layout of the site access. The proposal is supported by an archaeological trial trench evaluation. The County Council Archaeology response indicates that

there is no case to consider refusal of the proposal but that conditions would be appropriate to ensure investigation and recording during construction.

34. The application was supported by a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), which indicated that the site is within Flood Zone 1 to the north and east of the River Deben. As well as fluvial flooding this assessment considered other potential sources of floodrisk. In particular a surface water drainage strategy is included. The Environment Agency comments indicate that if the measures detailed in the FRA are carried out and secured by condition then the proposal would meet the requirements of the Framework.
35. Nearby residents are concerned about privacy and outlook. Plots 1-4 would be closest to the site boundary with the closest residential properties, plot 2 would be closest to Verandah Cottages. It would contain three first floor windows facing toward the side and garden areas of Verandah Cottages. Two of these would serve bathrooms and one a bedroom. The distance between the properties would be about 35 metres. Taking into account this separation and the size and type of windows I do not consider that there would be significant loss of privacy to Verandah Cottages sufficient to resist the scheme. In addition, given the separation distance, variation in storey heights, existing planting and potential for future planting, I do not consider that the location of the new dwellings would appear unduly overbearing.
36. The appellants have very clearly stated that there is no proposal to light the new car park area. The residents are concerned that lighting would have to be provided. I understand that from a safety perspective there may be a need for some form of external lighting for safe pedestrian movement in the car park and into and out of the school after dark. However, should this be the case I am satisfied that an appropriately worded condition could ensure that the Council has suitable control over the detail.
37. The appellants have submitted a unilateral undertaking to secure affordable housing and provision of additional land for car parking at the school. The Framework sets out policy tests for the seeking of planning obligations and there are similar statutory tests contained in Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations (2010) (CIL) which must be met for obligations to be given weight. These tests apply to the submitted obligation.
38. Provision for affordable housing is necessary to address local and national policy requirements and to help meet local needs for such housing. The provision of the car park is not based on any policy requirement. I do not doubt that it would be of benefit to the school. However, it would not be necessary to make the development acceptable. Overall, the obligation would be specifically and directly related to the site and its development and fairly and reasonably related to it in scale and kind, as well as the affordable housing being necessary to make it acceptable. Therefore I have taken the obligation into account in making my decision.

### **Conditions**

39. The Council has suggested a number of conditions which it considers would be appropriate were I minded to allow the appeal. I have considered these in light of the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance and for clarity some of the proposed wording is amended.

40. Conditions are necessary that relate to the standard time limits and requiring development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area conditions are necessary that require the submission of the detail of the materials for the development, a detailed landscaping scheme and management plan, boundary treatment details and tree protection measures.
41. In the interests of highway safety and to ensure that the development is well laid out conditions are necessary for the provision of estate roads, footpaths, provision of visibility splays and refuse and recycling bins. In addition conditions are necessary to secure a programme of archaeological works to ensure that appropriate site investigation and recording is undertaken.
42. To ensure proper drainage of the site a condition requiring a surface water drainage strategy is necessary. To protect the living conditions of nearby occupiers conditions are necessary to require a constructions management statement, details of any sewage pumping equipment, finished floor levels and lighting should it be required.
43. A protected species survey was undertaken and submitted. However, in the interests of biodiversity it is reasonable and necessary to secure the submission of a mitigation method statement.
44. There was no dispute that the suggested conditions regarding contamination and rainwater harvesting, for which there is no policy basis, are not necessary. I have no reason to disagree.

### **Conclusion**

45. The appeal scheme would slightly improve the supply of housing in the district in circumstances where the current adopted LP does not seek to meet the OAN and contains only a minimum new housing requirement. Moreover, it is due for a review, which is highly likely to seek increased provision of new housing.
46. There would be less than substantial harm to the setting of Verandah Cottages. This forms part of the consideration of the special regard of the listed building required by S66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and is a matter to which I attach substantial weight. The appeal proposal would not lead to significant and demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the area, having regard to its location adjacent to the CA, when assessed against CS policies and the policies of the Framework. In addition this is a suitable location for housing when considering access to services and facilities. In light of this I consider that the matters above and taken together with the benefit of the provision of 10 open market dwellings and 4 affordable dwellings would clearly outweigh the less than substantial harm identified to the setting of Verandah Cottages. Therefore having regard to this and all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*D J Board*

INSPECTOR

## **Annex A**

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan EAS1-1000; Site Layout EAS1-1001; Materials Plan EAS1-1002; Storey Heights Plan EAS1-1003; Plans for Plot 1 EAS1-1004; Plans for Plot 2 EAS1-1005; Plans for Plots 3-5 EAS1-1006; Plans for Plots 6-7 EAS1-1007; Plans for Plot 8 EAS1-1008; Plans for Plot 9 EAS1-1009; Plans for Plot 10 EAS1-1010; Plans for Plots 11-14 EAS1-1011; Garages EAS1-1050; Character Assessment EAS1-2000; Character Assessment EAS1-2001; Sketch Perspectives EAS1-4000; Sketch Overview EAS1-4001; Photomontage EAS1-5000.
- 3) No development shall take place until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the buildings hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 4) No dwelling shall be occupied until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority a scheme of landscaping, which shall include indications of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land, and details of any to be retained, together with measures for their protection in accordance with the agreed tree protection scheme in the course of development as well as details of tree and shrub planting, grass, earthworks, driveway construction, bin presentation areas, parking areas patios, hard surfaces etc, and other operations as appropriate), at a scale not less than 1:500.
- 5) All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which 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, unless the local planning authority gives written approval to any variation.
- 6) A landscape management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas, SUDS and play areas, other than small, privately owned, domestic gardens, shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority prior to the occupation of the development or any phase of the development, whichever is the sooner, for its permitted use. The landscape management plan shall be carried out as approved.
- 7) No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed before the buildings are occupied. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

- 8) Details of any lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the dwellings are occupied. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 9) No development shall commence until a reptile mitigation method statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 10) Before the development is commenced, details of the estate roads and footpaths, (including layout, levels, gradients, surfacing and means of surface water drainage), shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 11) No dwelling shall be occupied until the carriageways and footways serving that dwelling have been constructed to at least Binder course level or better in accordance with the approved details except with the written agreement of the Local Planning Authority.
- 12) The new estate road junction with The Street inclusive of cleared land within the sight splays to this junction must be formed prior to any other works commencing or delivery of any other materials.
- 13) The areas to be provided for storage of Refuse/Recycling bins as shown on drawing number EAS1-3000 shall be provided in its entirety before the development is brought into use and shall be retained thereafter for no other purpose.
- 14) No development shall take place until a programme of archaeological work has been implemented in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- 15) Following the completion of on-site archaeological investigations and recording the applicant must secure the implementation of a programme of post excavation work, in accordance with a written scheme of post excavation work, which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the Planning Authority. This programme will comprise an archive of the records and finds, an assessment of the importance of the results and, when appropriate, more detailed analysis and publication of the results.
- 16) Development shall not begin until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed. The scheme shall also include:
  - Sizing the proposed infiltration features to ensure the volume of water produced by the contributing area can be safely accommodated in all rainfall events up to the 1 in 100 year return period event, including allowances for climate change.

- The calculations provided within Appendix 3 and Plan IP\_13885\_07/SK002A provided within Appendix 2 of the Flood Risk Assessment dated July 2014 should form the basis of the scheme.
  - Details of how the infiltration features will be designed in accordance with the best practice contained in the CIRIA document C697 "The SUDS Manual".
  - Confirmation should also be provided that in the event of exceedance flows that surpass the critical duration rainfall event or a blockage/failure occurs within the drainage network any proposed features should incorporate an emergency spillway as part of their design.
  - 3. Supporting calculations, drawings and flow routing to demonstrate that the surface water drainage system has the ability to manage the volumes of water produced by all rainfall events up to the critical duration 1 in 100 year return period event including allowances for climate change.
  - Plans should demonstrate that the proposed drainage layout will perform as intended based on the topography of the site and the location of the proposed surface water management features. At the detailed design stage if the intention is for surface water to be conveyed to infiltration or storage features, further modelling of the surface water drainage system, including pipe network, will be required to ensure that in a range of events up to and including the critical duration 1 in 100 year return period event, including allowances for climate change, the system will be able to manage the expected volumes of water without causing nuisance or damage. In addition, a map detailing the infiltration features contributing areas (in correlation with the calculations supplied) should also be submitted.
  - Provide details of who will adopt and maintain each of the SuDS features for the lifetime of the development, along with the maintenance schedules. The maintenance requirements for the SuDS element of the proposed surface water drainage system should be formulated as per the recommendations within the CIRIA SuDS Manual (C697). The Local Planning Authority should be satisfied that arrangements are in place for the long term maintenance and management of the surface water management scheme.
- 17) No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall provide for:
- i) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors
  - ii) loading and unloading of plant and materials
  - iii) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development
  - iv) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate
  - v) wheel washing facilities

- vi) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction
  - vii) a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works.
- 18) Before the installation of any sewage pumping station details of the station, its equipment, its location, and acoustic housing shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval.
- 19) No development shall take place until details of ground and finished floor levels have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

## **APPEARANCES**

### FOR THE APPELLANT:

Robert Eburne	Hopkins Homes
Chris Smith	Hopkins Homes
Simon Bryan	Hopkins Homes
Ian Jamie	Hopkins Homes

### FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mark Edgeley	Suffolk Coastal District Council
Liz Beighton	Suffolk Coastal District Council
Nicholas Newton	Suffolk Coastal District Council
Robert Scrimgeour	Suffolk Coastal District Council
Neil McManus	Suffolk County Council

### INTERESTED PERSONS:

Sue Piggott	Easton Parish Council
Stephen Parkinson	Local resident
Derek Martin	Local resident
Carolyn Godfrey Hollins	Local resident
Chrissie Darby	Local resident
Charles Pollock	Local resident
C Burgoyne	Local resident
Ellis Barker	Local resident
Jonathan Duggan	Local resident
Mary Duggan	Local resident
Nigel Pike	Local resident
Jill Temperton	Local resident
Michael Coney	Local resident

### **DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING:**

1. Letter from Easton House dated 1 March 2016
2. Email from David Hunt dated 7 March 2016
3. Heritage Briefing Note on behalf of the appellant March 2016
4. Suffolk Coastal District Council Additional Supporting Information dated 3 March 2016
5. Letter to Suffolk Coastal District Council from CODE Development Planners regarding Adastral Park site dated 10 February 2016

### **DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AFTER THE HEARING**

1. Confirmation of and copy of final Statement of Common Ground
2. Email from Sue Piggott dated 10 March 2016
3. Email from Robert Eburne on behalf of Hopkins Homes dated 5 April 2016