



Application No: 152733 & 152794

Location: Former Severalls Hospital Site, Severalls Hospital, Boxted Road, Colchester, CO4 5HG

Scale (approx): NOT TO SCALE

The Ordnance Survey map data included within this publication is provided by Colchester Borough Council of Rowan House, 33 Sheepen Road, Colchester CO3 3WG under licence from the Ordnance Survey in order to fulfil its public function to act as a planning authority. Persons viewing this mapping should contact Ordnance Survey copyright for advice where they wish to licence Ordnance Survey map data for their own use.

This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey Material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller Of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Crown Copyright 100023706 2015

7.3 Case Officer: Alistair Day**MAJOR**

Site: Severalls Hospital, Boxted Road, Colchester, CO4 5HG

Application No: 152733

Date Received: 10 December 2015

Agent: Barton Wilmore

Applicant: Bellway Homes, Bloor Homes and Taylor Wimpey

Development: Application for approval of reserved matters following outline approval 151401 for erection of 730 new build residential dwellings, open space, landscaping, parking, access and associated infrastructure.

Ward: Mile End

Summary of Recommendation: Conditional Approval subject to signing of Section 106 Agreement

7.4 Case Officer: Alistair Day**MAJOR**

Site: Severalls Hospital, Boxted Road, Colchester, CO4 5HG

Application No: 152794

Date Received: 17 December 2016

Agent: Barton Wilmore

Applicant: Bellway Homes, Bloor Homes and Taylor Wimpey

Development: Full planning permission for highways improvements to facilitate the re-development of the Former Severalls Hospital.

Ward: Mile End

Summary of Recommendation: Conditional Approval subject to signing of Section 106 Agreement

1.0 Reason for Referral to the Planning Committee

- 1.1 This application is referred to the Planning Committee because of a late call-in (26 March 2016) made by Cllr Goss. Cllr Goss cites the following reason for calling this application in:

“This is a major application which must be heard in front of the planning committee. It is over 700 houses and major plans like this need to be considered by elected Members not carried out under delegated powers”.

The Planning Chair and the Group Spokes have agreed to Cllr Goss’s request.

2.0 Synopsis

- 2.1 The key issues explored below are:

- Impact on the Registered Park and Garden and the individual designated and undesignated heritage assets within it;
- Impact on protected trees and ecology;
- compliance with relevant adopted policy and standards together with the provisions of the outline planning consent and allied s.106 agreement.

3.0 Site Description and Context

- 3.1 The application site is located within the grounds of the former of Severalls Hospital. To the north of the site, between Tower Lane and United Way is the site of the recently approved David Lloyd Centre. Beyond United Way is the Weston Homes Community Stadium. Boxted Road defines the western extent of the application site. To the south of the site is the Northern Approach, which connects the A1341 Via Urbis Romanae (VUR) and Boxted Road. To the south of the Northern Approach are residential properties located on Defoe Crescent. The VUR bisects the site and to the south of this road is a small triangular shaped parcel of land which is accessed from Mill Road.
- 3.2 The application site is approximately 42.13 hectares and is characterised by the following key features:
- A central complex of vacant hospital buildings built to a broadly symmetrical echelon plan and surrounded by a kidney-shaped service road, lined by trees and landscape bunds;
 - a series of detached villas scattered in the outer grounds, each of which is surrounded by individual and groups of trees;
 - large areas of informal parkland and woodland; and
 - the east-west route of Tower Lane forming the northern perimeter and connecting Boxted Road with Mill Road.

- 3.3 The majority of the buildings within the central complex were built in 1910. The front administration building is listed grade II for its special architectural or historic interest. The ward blocks and associated building – including Larch Villa, the water tower, Myland Court, Chestnut Villa, the chapel, the later rendered nurse accommodation – constitute non-designated heritage assets. The grounds of the hospital are designated as a Registered Park and Garden and a large proportion of the trees are protected by a tree preservation order.
- 3.4 The original access to the former hospital was from Boxted Road. A new access on the east side of the site from VUR has recently been constructed and provides access to the application site, the new primary school (which is currently under construction) and the sites of the proposed community centre and mixed use area. Tower Lane that runs along the northern boundary of the site is a PRow.
- 3.5 The development parcel to the south of the VUR is accessed from Mill Road. The Mill Road access also serves the existing NHS buildings and the bowls club.

4.0 Description of the Proposal

- 4.1 Reserved matters approval is sought for Phase 2 of the re-development of former Severalls Hospital pursuant to outline application reference 151401. Permission is sought for the erection of 730 new-build residential dwellings, open space, landscaping, parking, access and associated infrastructure. The proposal will involve the demolition of the majority of the existing hospital buildings.
- 4.2 The application has been submitted by a consortium of developers comprising Bellway Homes, Bloor Homes and Taylor Wimpey. The proposed development can be broken down into two overarching character areas, namely the land within the kidney-shaped driveway (the Core) and the land outside the kidney (the Surrounds). Given the scale of the development, both the Core and the Surrounds have been broken down in sub-areas; the Surrounds comprise Areas A – C and Areas E - F1/ F2 and the Core Areas consist land parcels D1-3. These sub areas reflect the parcels of land to be developed by individual developers.

5.0 Land Use Allocation

- 5.1 The site is allocated for residential development reflecting the longstanding planning permission on the site.

6.0 Relevant Planning History

- 6.1 The relevant planning history for the former Severalls Hospital site is set out below:
- O/COL/01/1624 – outline planning permission approved for up to 1500 dwellings (including conversion of some retained hospital buildings), mixed uses including community and education facilities, retail, public open space and associated highway infrastructure.
 - 100035 (approved March 2011): Variations to amend the pre-occupation triggers for the delivery of the Northern Approach Road.

- 100502 Reserved Matters for the delivery of 248 homes on Phase 1 was granted by the Council on 4 August 2011. Phase 1 is being developed by Crest Nicholson and construction has commenced.
- 112401 (approved March 2012): This approved an updated Masterplan
- 131221 (approved November 2013): Variation to condition 8a to increase the number of dwellings which can be occupied prior to completion of the Northern Approach Road from 75 to 125 dwellings.
- 151401 (approved November 2015): This sought to regularise a number of conditions and was supported by a deed of variation to the original agreement to allow inclusion of a financial contribution of £2m for the Busway.
- 160147 Refurbishment of retained buildings (Larch House, Administration Building, Water Tower and part of the Echelon Building) to provide 20 residential units, car parking, landscaping and private amenity space - Pending

6.2 Two further applications have been approved at the site.

101527 Full planning permission was granted for the erection of a child and adolescent mental health unit. The mental health unit falls within Phase 2 of the Severalls Hospital site adjacent to Boxted Road. The mental health unit is now operation.

A Regulation 3 application for education development was made to Essex County Council (CC ref. CC/COL/52/14 (CBC ref 146500)) on 28 November 2014 for the construction of a two-storey, two-form entry Primary School with associated hard and soft play space, vehicle access and parking, hard and soft landscaping, drainage, lighting and fencing. The application was approved by Essex County Council in April 2015. The School is currently under construction.

7.0 Principal Policies

7.1 Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The National planning Policy Framework (NPPF) must also be taken into account in planning decisions and sets out the Government's planning policies are to be applied. The NPPF makes clear that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. There are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental.

7.2 Continuing the themes of the NPPF, the adopted Colchester Borough Core Strategy (adopted 2008, amended 2014) adds detail through local strategic policies. Particular to this application, the following policies are most relevant:

- SD1 - Sustainable Development Locations
- SD2 - Delivering Facilities and Infrastructure
- H1 - Housing Delivery
- H2 - Housing Density
- H3 - Housing Diversity
- H4 - Affordable Housing
- UR1 - Regeneration Areas
- UR2 - Built Design and Character
- PR1 - Open Space
- PR2 - People-friendly Streets

TA1 - Accessibility and Changing Travel Behaviour
TA2 - Walking and Cycling
TA3 - Public Transport
TA4 - Roads and Traffic
TA5 - Parking
ENV1 - Environment
ER1 - Energy, Resources, Waste, Water and Recycling

7.3 In addition, the following are relevant adopted Colchester Borough Development Policies (adopted 2010, amended 2014):

DP1 Design and Amenity
DP12 Dwelling Standards
DP14 Historic Environment Assets
DP16 Private Amenity Space and Open Space Provision for New Residential Development
DP17 Accessibility and Access
DP19 Parking Standards
DP20 Flood Risk and Management of Surface Water Drainage
DP21 Nature Conservation and Protected Lanes
DP25 Renewable Energy

7.4 Further to the above, the adopted Site Allocations (adopted 2010) policies set out below should also be taken into account in the decision making process:

SA NGA1 Appropriate Uses within the North Growth Area
SA NGA4 Transport measures in North Growth Area

7.5 Regard should also be given to the following adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents:

Vehicle Parking Standards
Sustainable Construction
The Essex Design Guide
External Materials in New Developments
Cycling Delivery Strategy
Severalls Hospital and Cuckoo Farm Masterplan and Written Statement
Myland Village Design Statement

7.6 Regard has also been had to the emerging Myland and Braiswick Neighbourhood Plan.

8.0 Consultations

Urban Design Officer

8.1 The Urban Design Officer made extensive comments on the original application submission. Updated Urban Design comments will be reported to Committee.

Landscape Officer

- 8.2 The Landscape Officer has requested various amendments in respect of the landscape content of the submission and has confirmed that he is generally satisfied with the Landscape Concept Proposal and the Recreational Proposal. Up-dated comments from the Landscape Officer on the submitted amendments will be reported to Committee

Conservation Officer

- 8.3 The Historic Buildings Officer has provided detailed comments on the original planning submission. The consultation response Summary is set in full below in relation to the scheme as originally submitted. Amendments have since been received:
- 8.4 While the proposal broadly replicates the layout of the approved 2011 scheme the details provided are disappointing. There is little distinction between the core and surrounds and in both cases while some architectural details copy those to be found on the site there is no attempt to draw this together into a coherent scheme. The haphazard use of features and materials does not reflect the ordered and considered architecture of the existing site. It is most unlikely that the ideals, principles or general character of the site would be detectable if this scheme was approved. The setting of the listed building and locally listed buildings would be substantially harmed and this would not be mitigated by any successful attempt to replicate the character of the buildings that once surrounded them. Deprived of any sense of their context their significance would be damaged. Whereas the quality of the 2011 scheme would have enabled some sense of the formal neo-classical core and the informal Arts and Crafts Surrounds to be understood this is not likely to be the case in this instance. The contemporary language used in the 2011 design code responded well to the neo-classical idiom of the historic hospital buildings that were on site and 'Accordia' in Cambridge indicates how successful such an approach can be. It is not necessary to replicate this but the formality and grandeur of the neo-classical buildings needs to be much more apparent than it would be at present. A rational design language and architectural treatment for different parts of the site is imperative to replicate character.
- 8.5 The Heritage Statement reminds the LPA that the NPPF states that proposals that preserve significance or better reveal significance of heritage assets should be treated favourably. This scheme would result in a development that obscures the significance of the site to a greater degree than is appropriate or necessary. There are clear opportunities to reveal significance through a stronger architectural approach and a closer adherence to the prevalent character of the site. Without this there is no justification for the substantial harm that the scheme would entail because it would fail to accord to the presumption against harm set out in section 66(i) of the Act.
Officer comment: Amendments have been sought in the light of the shortcomings identified.

Archaeological Officer

- 8.6 The Archaeological Officer has requested further evaluation – comprising geophysical survey of open areas to be affected by development and trial-trenched evaluation. He has also agreed that an indicative Written Scheme of Investigation for any further excavation should be agreed with the Council.

- 8.7 In terms of the standing buildings, the Archaeological Officer has advised that a building recording programme should be undertaken (Level 3 or 2 depending on the number / typology of building).

Tree Officer

- 8.8 The Tree Officer has requested various amendments / additional justification in respect of the tree content of the submission. He has however confirmed that he is in broad agreement with the submitted Tree Survey and Arboricultural Assessment. Updated comments from the Tree Officer on the submitted amendments will be reported to Committee

Environmental Protection Team

General

- 8.9 The Environmental Protection Team have reviewed the revised Ardent Noise Impact Assessment report reference No C622-03A dated March 2016. They have confirmed that the noise readings taken provide sufficient information and the noise modelling incorporates the predicated traffic flow and noise mitigation measures. The development must be constructed in accordance with the specifications listed in the report and these specifications must be considered the minimum acceptable for construction.
- 8.10 Environmental Protection has also confirmed that the existing conditions attached to the outline planning permission provide adequate control measures for demolition and construction on this phase.

Contamination

- 8.11 The planning file labelled 'Site Investigation Report and Infiltration Results' contains no documents, however, the file does contain an RSK Geotechnical Briefing Note. Whilst this is a geotechnical review, it has made reference to some potential sources of contamination which require investigation. In addition, I note from the Barton Wilmore Planning Statement, dated December 2015, that a Contamination Survey will follow. At this stage I therefore have no comments in relation to contamination matters, other than to await the additional risk assessments

Housing Development Officer

- 8.12 The Council's Affordable Housing Development Officer has expressed the following concerns in respect of the affordable housing proposed for Phase 2:
- 8.13 The submitted scheme does not proportionately reflect the private sale mix of housing. Adopted guidance set out in the SPD Affordable Housing states that the SPD will contribute to social cohesion since it requires affordable housing to be 'pepper potted' around the site and that a range of affordable housing dwellings will be required on the site, which should match the proportions of different types of dwellings within the open market housing. In this regard shortcomings are identified in the submission where the house sizes/bedroom numbers in the proposals greatly differ between the open market and affordable homes. For example the majority of 3 bed affordable homes are

82m2 in area whereas only 11% of the 3 bed on market are below 82m2 with 89% above 82m2. The affordable units are not tenure blind therefore but differ in size from the open market equivalent homes (smaller).

- 8.14 The critical point to note is the proportion of affordable house types does not match the overall mix in the scheme; both in terms of the number of bedrooms but also the size of the units. For example the 3 bed affordable homes proposed at 82m2 would traditionally provide a 3 bed (4 person) home whereas it is expected that a three bed home would be large enough to accommodate five persons (over 90 m2) A snapshot of the recent data on our housing register confirms that 40% of applicants require 3 bed (4 person) accommodation with 40% requiring at least 3 bed (5 person) accommodation.
- 8.15 Within the Borough, there is a strong need for 3 bed (5 person) accommodation (and very little need for 3 bed (4 person) units as we can house 4 people in a 2 bed home). Given this, it is critical that the size of the proposed 3 bed affordable units is increased in size to reflect the more generous floor areas of the open market accommodation.
- 8.16 The s106 agreement requires the affordable housing to include at least 3 two bed roomed four person Bungalows on Phase 2. The bungalows must fully comply with Category 3 of Building Regulations 2010 Approved Document Part M (2015 Edition) Category 3. The proposals as submitted do not adhere to this requirement.
- 8.17 The location of the affordable homes all appear to be located within the outer edges of the site and not, therefore, fully integrated within development as required by the adopted SPD.
- 8.18 Further information is required on the Tenure split: the proposals need to set out the tenure split (affordable rent, intermediate and assisted purchase etc.) to ensure the affordable housing provision is integrated and proportionally split between the tenures to ensure there are equally provided home types between tenures.

Street Services

- 8.19 No comments received.

Transportation Planning

- 8.20 The key internal connection for walking and cycling is the “kidney”; creating a hub and spoke of walking and cycle routes. The external walking and cycle routes need to connect into the “kidney” as this offers traffic free access around the development. The policy proposes that priority should be given to those walking and cycling. This can be enhanced through changes to the design as suggested below:
- Improving the priority the “kidney” route where it crosses the main east west “Boulevard”
 - Reinforcing permeability from the adjoining developments and external linkages

8.21 Additional comments made can be summarised as follows:

- The access for walking and cycling in south west corner needs to be strengthened and routes linked to the Kidney.
- From the access on Boxted Road a shared use cycle path should be provided on both side of the road to the “kidney”.
- The mini roundabout on the Boulevard should have the cycle routes redesigned to have orbital cycle tracks and crossing points, rather than 4 “concave” arcs which upset the flow and continuity of cycle paths.
- Upgrading the path on Boxted Road is welcomed as this provides an external link for the developments on the westside of the site.
- The pavement along the A134 Northern Approach Road is currently signed as shared use up to the large tree. This section should be up graded to be shared use along the NAR to its junction with Boxted Road. The pedestrian link to the west of the SUDS should be upgraded to shared use link.
- The Kidney provides excellent traffic free walking and cycle access. Priority should be given to walking and cycling movements across the main east-west Boulevard. On the eastern side, the design should be altered to provide orbital cycle routes of the roundabout giving access to the primary school.
- A continuous internal north south shared use route should be provided from the access point on the VUR, northwards across the development to link with Tower Lane in the north west corner.
- The development (area f1) to the south east side of the site (in the vicinity of where Oakwood Villa was) is isolated at the end of a “cul de sac” and needs a direct walking and cycle link to the kidney at the southern end of this area. Previous maps of the site showed a vehicle link from the old Oakwood Villa area to the “kidney” – a link in the area should be provided.
- The links to Tower Lane should be 3m shared use pedestrian cycle links
The Boulevard must allow for a two way bus service which was envisaged as part of the draft North Colchester Travel Strategy. To serve the development two pairs of stops with shelters, raised kerbs, flag, lighting, and real time information should be provided.
- The speed and volume of the traffic needs to be restrained to ensure that Boulevard (or other streets) is not used by through traffic either from the A134 or the Boxted Road to gain access to the A12 at junction 28 (or vice versa) or locations further east. To do this would suggest greater use of restraint measures to slow the speed of traffic including raised tables, for example where the “kidney” crosses the east-west boulevard at both ends and the other residential streets to the north east corner (area C to D2) of the “kidney”.
- The size of the covered cycle space is not specified in the design standard however the 1.8m x 1.2m size suggested for the “shed” is small if the “shed” is to be used for other storage and to be give easy access to a bike in everyday use.
- The location of the visitor cycle parking needs to be identified.
- More detail needs to be provided on the bike storage for apartments. It has not been possible to assess the type of bike storage to be provided for the apartments and whether these are secure and usable for the number of bikes to be catered for.

Ecological Advice from ECCOS

8.22 Comments to be reported.

Highway Authority

8.23 From a highway and transportation perspective the impact of the proposal is acceptable to the Highway Authority subject to:

- Specified amendments to the provision / widths of footpath and/or cycleways in identified location;
- Forward visibility at all bends within proposed highway
- A 0.5 metre strip between all structures and proposed highway
- Allowance for any required street lighting
- All vehicle tracking clear of all private property boundaries/proposed highway and visitor parking spaces
- Main spine road; remove narrowing outside plot 29

8.24 The Highway Authority has also advised that:

- They are comfortable that the proposed design should ensure vehicle speeds are kept to 20 mph or lower however this would not be finalised until the 20 mph zone Order is completed, whereupon it might be some additional calming measures are needed. This can be addressed as part of the s38 agreement.
- The access off Mill Road would be able to accommodate the proposed development.
- Parking controls to address issues with visitor parking (stadium/school etc.) can be addressed as part of the s38 highway agreement

Lead Local Flood Authority

8.25 Following the submission of additional information the LLFA has accepted the proposed Runoff Rates. They have also accepted that SuDS treatment may not be possible given the site constraints; however they have advised that an alternative treatment should be provided using proprietary features such as petrol interceptors, with an explanation given as to how their treatment efficiency would appropriately address the pollution potential of the roads. Regarding Urban Creep the LLFA has advised that an allowance of 3% for urban creep is acceptable given that permitted development rights have been removed for extension.

Anglian Water

8.26 No comments received.

The Environment Agency

8.27 No comments received.

Highways England

- 8.28 Highway England has stated that they have no objection to this application.

Natural England

- 8.29 Comments to be reported

Historic England

- 8.30 Historic England has advised that the application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance and on the basis of your specialist conservation advice.

Essex Garden's Trust

- 8.31 It is good to see that the landscape plan responds to some of the features of the designed landscape. It is however difficult to agree with the Heritage Statement's view that the design is positive or beneficial, but in the circumstances, it is correct to see the masterplan as the baseline for assessing the designed landscape, which can no longer be readily reconciled to the description in the list. It is to be hoped that your authority will ensure the implementation of those elements in the landscape plan which incorporate parts of the designed landscape so that a little of it is preserved.

In addition to the details reported above, the full text of all consultation responses is available to view on the Council's website.

9.0 Parish Council Response

- 9.1 Myland Community Council's (MCC) comments are summarised as follows:

- MCC welcome the pre application involvement.
- MCC welcomes that there will be a range of designs and styles and note that the affordable units include 3 wheelchair friendly bungalows. Nevertheless, MCC is concerned that there is been little provision for potential elderly residents.
- Policy HOU1 of the submitted Myland and Braiswick Neighbourhood Plan refers to design and living styles that meet the needs of residents, including the elderly. MCC would therefore expect to see the provision of 10%, of dwellings designed to 'Lifetime Home' standards.
- Policy SAM1 seeks amenity provision amongst which GP surgeries are cited. There is no evidence that this has been considered. MCC note also there is no reference to potential sites for crèche or nursery provision. These are regarded as examples of what constitute sustainable development.
- MCC is reassured by the provision of ecological report.
- MCC is pleased with the efforts proposed to retain the spirit of the Severalls Hospital, including retention of existing buildings, within in the overall design. In particular, the retention and enhancement of the Grade 2 listed parkland, which will enhance the site and benefit local nature.
- MCC note the proposed provision of a bus route. Following complaints from

residents of Severalls Phase 1 MCC ask that the bus stops are not located outside any dwellings. It is not clear how the foot and/or cycle routes will connect to established or future community areas to provide a connection across North Colchester. MCC is concerned about the barrier effect of the Via Urbis Romanae (VUR) which separates the two residential areas and would seek assurances that this will be addressed.

- MCC wishes to express our concern regarding F1 area (rear of Mill Road). The use of the Therapy Road exit onto Mill Road is poorly planned and we suggest the exit should be onto the VUR instead. Mill Road, particularly at this junction, suffers a high traffic density. MCC is currently seeking a ban on all unnecessary HGV traffic on Mill Road. We would certainly argue against construction traffic using this exit in preference to exiting onto the VUR

Cllr Goss (also signed by Cllr Dominic Graham, Cllr Anne Turrell and Phil Coleman)

The email notes that whilst “we are not yet raising a formal objection to the Severalls Phase 2 application we are raising some strong areas for serious consideration and overall concern. Failure to properly resolve them will potentially mean a separate objection is raised against any outstanding points. The issues raised in the email are summarised below:

Construction traffic

There are potentially 4 routes in and out of the site and of course not all will be accessible from Day 1 as changes will be required or new addition highway will require creation. We need a clearly agreed construction management plan for this site No construction traffic must travel down Mill Road. Equally construction traffic must not come up and down or enter via Boxted Road. The only route in must be the existing Northern Approach Road. Wheel washing and daily road sweeping of the entire route must also take place. Delivery hours must also be adhered to. With a new school opening in 2016 with no safe area for children to be dropped off, using this area for construction traffic as well is simply unacceptable.

Officer Comment: *Conditions are attached to the outline planning permission requiring details to be submitted of the construction method statement. Both the Council’s Environmental Protection Team and the local Highway Authority will be consulted on the submission for the discharge of this condition to ensure that the construction traffic proposals are acceptable in terms of highway safety and do not cause a significant adverse nuisance to the amenity of residents. The consortium has suggested a condition be added to ensure no construction traffic/deliveries take place during school pick-up/drop-off times.*

Trees and wildlife

There seems to be a general assumption that many of the “legendary” trees will need to be removed and destroyed due to poor health of the specimens. Many of the trees in question have TPO’s. This whole area needs further work before we are convinced we need to lose so many historic trees. Although it is recognised some new planting will come forwards, all efforts must be made to preserve as many as possible.

Further ecology work and wildlife surveys are also required. We would also like to see Bat boxes and bird boxes included on site for wildlife please. We must also ensure maximum retention of the historic garden elements of this site.

Officer Comment: *A comprehensive tree survey has been submitted in support of this application. The Council's Tree and Landscape Officers have been fully consulted and the form and layout of the development proposals reflects their direct input. To better explain the ecological impacts of this development additional ecological information and survey work has been requested during the course of this application. The Council has sought specialist ecological advice by appointing its own consultant to advise on this matter and has worked closely with Natural England. The advice and recommendations of the ecologist are set out in this report.*

Bus routes

There are already issues with bus stops and yellow lines being painted on Severalls Phase 1 to the surprise of many residents. The bus service operator is not known. This information needs to be forthcoming otherwise a bus route is being built with absolutely no operator in mind. We absolutely support sustainable transport and bus routes where feasible but history and experience shows there is no joined up thinking and it needs resolving at application stage and not once everything is built! There also has to be a question surrounding bus stops and bus shelters. These should be included if a route is required and the shelters should be ECC ones which the developer must fund.

Officer Comment: *As required by the Council's adopted SPG, the spine road that links Boxted Road to the VUR has been designed to accommodate bus traffic. Whilst it is considered important to design public transport links into major development proposals; it will be for the local bus operators to decide if and when to introduce a bus service through this development. The location of bus stops is shown on the layout plans.*

Parking restrictions, resident only parking, yellow lines and stadium parking

A scheme needs to be in place to stop commuter, hospital and stadium parking. An appropriate parking scheme needs to be proposed at application stage so new residents are aware when purchasing their houses. The developer must fund any scheme and this needs to be a condition of this application. There could also be issues with parking from the Northern Gateway especially if a Cinema does open there. If further bus lane cameras are to be installed they must be operational. The developer should fund them and also include maintenance costs in any funding agreed.

Officer Comment: *This issue falls outside the control of the Local Planning Authority. The issue has however been raised with both the developer and the Highway Authority. The developer has advised that they do not want indiscriminate visitor parking to cause a nuisance to the new residents and would like to introduce appropriate controls to prevent this from occurring. The Highway Authority has advised the introduction of parking control measures will need to be agreed as a part of the highway adoption approval process.*

Parking standards

These need to follow the agreed adopted Parking Standards and where possible an increase in parking available. If the parking standards are revised and improved during the construction of this development, where legally and practicably possible newer standards should apply.

Officer Comment: *The applicants have been advised of the requirement to adhere to the adopted parking standards. The scheme now provides for parking in excess of the relevant adopted standard. Any changes in adopted standards that occur after consent has been granted cannot be applied retrospectively.*

Highways

There are serious concerns about having access points from 4 different locations. It has already proven not to work where retrospectively protection is added to the “bus gate” off Mill Road and yet people still drive through this making it yet another rat run to and from the A12 and to Mill Road.

Access to the development off Mill Road is not acceptable and also from Boxted Road. All access should be to and from the NAR 2 and NAR 3 only. We need to reduce traffic on Mill Road, not add to it again. This area needs a serious rethink.

Officer Comment: *The Highway Authority has not raised an objection to the proposed access arrangements. Conditions also require the submission of a construction method statement.*

Allotments

The addition of allotments is welcomed. We do share the concerns of some Mill Road residents where these will back directly onto their properties. These allotments should either be moved further away inside the development or extra protection should be offered to the residents with high secure close boarded fencing or deep vegetation.

Officer Comment: *the size (area), location and requirement for the handover of the allotments were agreed as a part of the outline planning approval.*

Cycle and pedestrian access

Cycle and pedestrian access must be maximised on this development to allow access to all areas of Mile End and all infrastructure. Cycle racks and other appropriate facilities must also be added and under newer guidance where possible horse bridleways also added.

Officer comment: *The layout has been designed to create a development that maximises pedestrian and cycle permeability.*

Boxted Road pedestrian route widening and NAR crossing

This is a top item to be delivered! The safe pedestrian route along Botted Road needs to be delivered to allow safe pedestrian access to and from the stadium as well as to the new Severalls development. Improved lighting must also be included as part of this package. A pedestrian crossing at the end of Botted Road with the existing NAR must also be included as part of these measured and long overdue improvements.

Officer comment: *This facility is secured under the Severalls Hospital s106 agreement.*

Gated Route from Stadium to Botted Road

A pedestrian gated route from United Way which comes out on Botted Road was added to try and help improve pedestrian safety. This route must remain.

Officer comment: *The applicant has provided assurance that this route will remain.*

Historic preservation of the site

Where the historic buildings will remain maximum effort must be put into saving and developing these buildings to maximise the quality of the overall preservation and long term quality of the living accommodation. These proposals must be scrutinised and if necessary specialist independent consultants must be appointed to oversee the proposals submitted with a full report coming back as part of the application scrutiny.

Officer comment: *The need to safeguard the retained buildings and prevent them from deteriorating further is accepted as is the need to bring these buildings back into an active economic use as soon as possible.*

Multiple builders

We need one lead developer taking overall lead and ownership for all infrastructure, roads and open spaces. We cannot have this built by multiple developers as the experience when it comes to quality and adoption is poor. The developer needs to explain how the phasing and house building will take place.

We also need to ensure control where developers decide to try and change the overall plans by putting in planning amendments once the main plans are agreed. Experience has shown developers try and push through changes which have a detriment to the development long-term for short-term gain.

Officer comment: *A phasing plan has been requested from the applicants. Any changes to approved plans will require further consent. The identity of the developer(s), whether singular or multiple, is not a planning consideration.*

Management Company and control

This is an area which highlights issues time and time again. It is a recipe for disaster if we don't set the ground rules at planning stage. I have experienced too many developers where multiple management companies are added, all covering different parts of the development and in fact some areas are never covered as tiny plots of land are conveyed to residents which then undergo various levels of maintenance, especially where properties get rented out. There are also issues with the way leases or land ownership is conveyed or set-up which means management companies cannot be removed by those who ultimately pay for them through management charges. This development must ensure if a management company is employed, the same company is used by the whole development. All areas must be equally managed to the same standard and once Residential Directors are appointment, the ability to remove the company and appoint someone new must also be included. It would be sensible to follow the same arrangements as followed by Severalls Phase 1 so one overall management company and structure is used. Residential Directors should also be appointed part way through a build rather than the anticipation the whole development needs to be completed as this will take up to a decade. Residents must also be clear what they are paying for and if all play grounds and open space does remain the responsibility of the management company rather than the public purse, residents must be clear as to replace a playground in 10 years time will be £90k. There will also be annual Health and Safety checks which will all be paid for by residents.

Officer comment: *The framework for the provision of a management company is set out in the s106 agreement. The consortium has confirmed that there will only be one management company and structure across the whole site.*

Community Centre

An honest and open dialogue needs to be held with the appropriate stakeholders about the size and quality of the proposed community centre. It would be anticipated the developers would help with a quality fit-out at their own cost outside of the legal 106 agreement details.

Officer comment: *The framework for the provision of the community centre is set out in the s106 agreement.*

Litterbins and dog bins

The developer is expected to provide adequate dog and litter bins to cover all walking routes, open spaces and play grounds and to ensure the area is clean and tidy at all times.

Officer Comment: *This will form part of the detailed landscaping scheme.*

Adoption of Highway, open spaces and play areas

Roads should be completed early on and not left half tarmaced with the top mix missing for years. A condition should be put on this to ensure compliance and an agreed structure for completion and adoption. The same for public open spaces and play areas if these are to come into public ownership tighter controls must be in place for quick completion, a quality product and quick adoption.

Officer comment: *The framework for the provision of the public open space play areas is set out in the s106 agreement. The adoption of roads and footpaths is the responsibility of the local Highway Authority.*

Bin store design

Bin store design for any flats must follow the latest standards and include enough space for recycling.

Officer comment: *The scheme has been designed in accordance with the Council's adopted guidance.*

Street names and street name plates

Street names have already been suggested to follow historic figures and the rich history of the site.

Officer comment: *A meeting on this issue has been arranged between Cllr Goss and the consortium..*

10.0 Representations

10.1 17 letters of representation have been received in respect of this application. The issues raised are summarised below:

- Bridleways or off routes should be added to keep horses away from traffic
- A bridleway link to Highwoods should be provided
- More smaller houses should be provided
- Supporting infrastructure required
- The development will compound congestion
- Boxted Road should be kept free of heavy traffic and is not suitable for additional traffic
- The impact of the development on existing residents needs to be considered
- Access point onto Boxted Road is not acceptable
- Allotments to rear of gardens in mill Road is unacceptable
- Road improvement are required before development starts
- Pedestrian / cycle route along Boxted Road need to be delivered
- Development should be deferred until existing infrastructure deficits are addressed.
- There will be a conflict between construction traffic for this development and the adjacent Chesterwell development (particularly around Fords Lane roundabout).
- The areas of open space should be developed last; the areas of the hospital buildings should be tackled first to improve the appearance of the area. .

- The s016 agreement should not be amended further.
- The application should be decided by the Planning Committee not officers.
- The development fails to improve / enhance Public Rights of Ways
- As many as possible of the Severalls Hospital buildings should be preserved.
- The hospital site layout should also be reflected in any new builds.

Colchester Cycle Campaign

10.2 The comments by CCC can be summarised as follows:

- The proposals for the 'kidney route' are welcomed but better connection need to be made to it.
- High-quality cycle routes towards each of the main attractors segregated cycle path should avoid conflict
- There should be no staggered barriers; bollards should only be used to keep cars off cycle paths and cycle routes should be signposted
- Station route - this path appears to be fitting around plots of houses; a direct approach would be better both in terms of following a desire line and for increased social safety. The path should be curved rather than angled.
- Links to Chesterwell - a 20mph road will be fine for most cyclists, but this route will be relatively busy, particularly at peak traffic periods. A wide footpath should be put in place for the use of students of the mooted senior school on Chesterwell Woods. This path could go on either the north or south of the road and should connect to "the kidney".
- Connections to Boxted Road and the north - this development needs very good permeability so that walkers and cyclists can access the employment/leisure facilities to the north.
- Link to the primary school - While we are encouraged that the school is to have its own access from "the kidney" it is disconcerting to note that the school's internal road layout looks likely to put pedestrians and cyclists in conflict on the approach to the school car park
- Route to the hospital - The connection to the hospital is an important one
- Along the NAR – the path adjacent to the Northern Approaches Road should be shared use along its length.

The full text of all of the representations received is available to view on the Council's website.

11.0 Parking Provision

11.1 The scheme incorporates more vehicular parking than required by policy and cycle parking also conforms to the standard (See Paragraph 15.80 to 15.84).

12.0 Open Space Provisions

12.1 With the exception of two plots all of the gardens comply with adopted standards with 23 hectares of strategic open space and woodland provided in conformity with the s.106 agreed in connection with the outline consent. (See Paragraphs 15.55 to 15.60).

13.0 Air Quality

- 13.1 The site is outside of any Air Quality Management Area and will not generate significant impacts upon the zones.

14.0 Development Team and Planning Obligations

- 14.1 This application is classed as a “Major” application and therefore there was a requirement for it to be considered by the Development Team. The Development Team noted that this application was submitted pursuant to an outline application and that s106 obligations to mitigate the impact of this development were agreed at the time the outline application was determined. The Development Team did not raise any comments in respect of this reserved matters planning submission.

15.0 Report

The Policy Context

- 15.1 It is a statutory requirement for a planning application to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. This requirement is also reflected in guidance set out in the NPPF. The Council has a suite of up-to-date and fully adopted Development Plan Documents, including a Core Strategy (CS), Site Allocations (SA) and Proposals Maps and Development Plan Policies (DPD). The Council has also adopted a Supplementary Planning Document in respect of Severalls Hospital.
- 15.2 The Council's CS provides the overarching policy direction for the local plan and for the delivery of development, infrastructure, facilities and services in Colchester to 2021 and 2023 for housing. Policies SD1 and H1 promote sustainable development and identify broad locations for growth. The majority of housing will be focused within the Council's Regeneration Areas and two greenfield growth areas to the north and south-west of Colchester. The application site forms part of the identified regeneration area in the northern growth area. Other CS policies that are relevant to this application are: Policy UR2 which seeks to secure high quality and inclusive design in new development; Policy PR1 which requires the provision of open space to meet the needs of new communities; PR2 which promotes secure, attractive people-friendly streets; Policy TA1-TA4 which seeks to improve sustainable transport links and promote people friendly street and ENV1 which seeks to protect and enhance the Borough's natural and historic environment.
- 15.3 The policy approach to the North Growth Area, which includes the Severalls Hospital site, is subject to specific policies in the SA (policies NGA1 to SA NGA5). These reflect that the site has been a long term allocation for residential development.
- 15.4 The SA DPD provides more detailed planning policies and supports those of the Core Strategy. A total of 25 policies are set out addressing a variety of issues including sustainable development, public realm, transport and accessibility, environment.

- 15.5 The Council's development plan is considered to be up to date and this has not been disputed by the applicant.
- 15.6 National policy is set out in the NPPF and this together with the accompanying guidance document constitutes a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. The NPPF reaffirms the requirement that planning applications should be determined in accordance with development plans, unless materials considerations indicate otherwise. The NPPF also states that where sites are allocated for housing they should be approved without delay.

Planning Background

- 15.7 Outline planning permission (O/COL/01/1624) was granted for the redevelopment of the former Severalls Hospital site on 21 March 2006. This application proposed up to 1500 dwellings (including conversion of some retained hospital buildings), mixed uses including community and education facilities, retail, public open space and associated highway infrastructure.
- 15.8 The outline planning permission has been formally varied a number of times, most recently in November 2015 when Members' approved changes to selected outline planning conditions and the s106 agreement (ref 151401). The current reserved matters planning application has been submitted pursuant to this application.
- 15.9 Condition 4 of application 151401 requires the reserved matters application to accord with the approved Broadway Malayan Masterplan and Design Code. This requirement is also set out in the s106 agreement.
- 15.10 The Masterplan identifies the buildings to be retained and key areas of landscape. The buildings identified for retention are:
- The Administration Building - A grade II listed building located on the central axis of the Kidney
 - The Water Tower - A highly distinctive building located within the kidney and significant local landmark
 - The Echelon wing to the west of the Kidney
 - Larch House; and
 - Airing Shelters

Key areas of landscape that are to be retained comprise:

- The external and internal air courts
 - Myland Villa Gardens
 - The part of the former cricket pitch to the south the main echelon building; and
 - Two areas of woodland to the north of kidney
- 15.11 The Master Plan also identifies key access routes and linkages both within the site and to adjacent sites. The Design Code identifies the main land use areas and sets out key principles to be followed for the design and layout of the Phase 2 Severalls Hospital development.

The Proposal

- 15.12 The reserved matters submission proposes 730 residential dwellings, open space, landscaping, parking, access and associated infrastructure. The number of units proposed falls within the scope of the outline planning approval. The Master Plan identifies two main character areas (the Core and the Surrounds). The application site has been further subdivided into smaller parcels (reflecting the site characteristics and the areas to be developed by individual developers); these areas comprise Area D1 – 3 within the Core and Areas A-C, E-F in the Surrounds. In broad land use terms, the proposed character areas accord with the approved Master Plan and Design Statement.
- 15.13 A separate full application has been submitted in respect of the proposed access onto Nayland Road and Mill Road (ref 152794). This is due to the fact that the some of the land required to facilitate the access improvement falls outside the boundary of the outline planning approval.
- 15.14 Approximately a further 20 homes are proposed in the buildings that have been identified for retention. The conversion of the retained buildings is the subject of a separate application (ref 160147).
- 15.15 The total number of new homes delivered between Phase 1 and 2 of the Severalls Hospital development will be approximately 1000 homes. This is a third less than the original outline permission envisaged. The reduction in the number of units proposed is due to a number of reasons including: part of the site being retained by the NHS for Mental Health purpose; changes in market demand for certain unit types (larger units preferred to apartments), constraints imposed by trees and changes in current (adopted) design standards and the emerging highway standards.

Design

- 15.16 CS Policy UR2 seeks to promote and secure high quality design. The Policy states that developments that are discordant with their context and fail to enhance the character and quality of the area will not be supported. DPD DP1 sets out design criteria that new development must meet. These require new development to respect the character of the site and its context in terms of detailed design and respecting and enhancing its surroundings. Further design guidance is set out the Severalls Hospital SPD and the Essex Design Guide.
- 15.17 Section 7 of the NPPF establishes the importance the Government attaches to the design of the built environment, with paragraph 58 setting out relevant criteria. While paragraph 60 states that architectural styles should not be imposed, nor should innovation be stifled, it is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness. Paragraph 64 explicitly states that 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. The supporting guidance document to the NPPF notes that local building forms and details contribute to the distinctive qualities of a place and that standard solutions rarely create a distinctive identity or make best use of a particular site. The use of local materials, building methods and details can be an important factor in enhancing local distinctiveness when used in evolutionary local design, and can also be used in more contemporary design.

15.18 Condition 4 of the outline permission requires that the new buildings on Phase 2 of the Severalls Hospital development to respond to the principles set out within the 2011 Design Statement. The Design and Access Statement that has been submitted in support of this current reserved matters application explains that the principles set out in the approved Master Plan have formed the basis of the land use extent of development, access and movement, general permeability across the site, urban form, architecture and landscape design.

The Core

15.19 The Design Statement set the key principles for the redevelopment of the Core. These are:

- the layout should a rectangular grid plan framework;
- the architecture should to relate closely to the character of the historic hospital buildings without attempting a pastiche copy;
- the new echelon buildings fronting onto the park landscape should have a continuous frontage and have the same scale, rhythm and materials as the historic ward blocks;
- projecting bays and balconies are required to echo the equivalent elements within the architecture of the historic buildings
- a marker building to replace the former Assistant Medical Officer House.
- the boulevards and squares are fronted by three storey buildings (sometimes continuous and sometimes with 2 storey elements) and buildings fronting shared surfaces / mews courts should generally 2 storey with 3 storey at junctions or axial terminations

15.20 The submitted Design and Access Statement states that the Core development is an area with formal development frontages and that the building features / details will derive from the retained and historic building elements.

15.21 The proposed development within the Core adopts a regimented layout arranged around a series of boulevards and squares. The proposal in this respect accords with the requirements of the approved Design Statement. The new echelon buildings (as originally submitted) proposed a combination of 2, 2.5 and 3 storey buildings and these buildings lacked the solid / void relationship and strong vertical emphasis of the historic hospital buildings. This scheme did not adhere to the principles set out in the approved Design Statement. Amended proposals for the new echelon buildings have been undertaken so that, for the most part, they now present a continuous frontage to the parkland landscape and are mainly three storeys with short connecting elements of two and a half storeys. Whilst the heights of the replacement echelon buildings do not strictly accord with the requirements of the approved Design Statement, the visually prominent frontages and, in particularly those areas adjacent to the retained wings, are now three storeys in height and the continuity of built form helps to create the perception of a unified frontage. There have also been changes to the design of the elevations. The proposed changes have gone some way to addressing the concerns raised by officers in respect of the failure of the original submission to echo the character of the former hospital buildings. Notwithstanding this, some of the proposed buildings still fail to echo the rhythm and detailing of the historic hospital

buildings and therefore conditions are proposed requiring alternative designs to be submitted.

- 15.22 Within the main body of the Core, the Spine Road is fronted by mainly 2.5 and three storey buildings. The proposed development creates a continuity of frontage and has a formal character, which is further reinforced by the avenue tree planting. Whilst the building heights do not wholly conform to the requirements of the approved Design Statement, the uniformity of design, continuity of frontage, combined with the tree planting, is considered sufficient to create an acceptable form of development to this street. As originally submitted, two storey development was proposed to front the north / south boulevards and internal airing courts. The applicants, and in particular Bellway, have stated that they do not believe that there is a demand for three storey housing in Colchester. It is accepted that there is probably a finite market for this type of housing and for this reason officers have indicated a willingness to accept 2 and 2.5 storey buildings in these locations, provided the built form adopts a composed composition and that the buildings have richness in terms of their architectural detailing. As originally submitted the buildings proposed in these locations do not achieve this. The proposed scheme also does not include a marker building to replace the Assistant Medical Officers House. This has been raised with the applicant and they are currently considering alternative design solutions for this part of the site.
- 15.23 The design of buildings within the main body of the Core (as originally submitted) were considered to be excessively stripped back and created a development with an undistinguished appearance. Concern was also expressed that some of the built forms proposed within this part of the Core were inappropriate to the architectural character that the development was seeking to achieve. Suggestions on how to improve the overall character and appearance of these buildings have been made to the applicant and they have agreed to re-consider their elevational treatment / detailing. At the time of writing this report, Officers have not had an opportunity to properly assess the amended building designs proposed within the Core. A verbal update will be provided.
- 15.24 The Design Statement states that materials within the Core will be red brick and slate. The proposals adhere to this requirement. The use of quality materials (which includes an appropriate mortar mix and bond) is of fundamental importance. Likewise, boundary enclosures to the development will be of great importance, particular where the built form is such that it does not create an appropriate sense of continuity or enclosure. It is considered that the front boundary enclosures (with the exception of new echelon buildings) should comprise brick piers and walls or brick walls and railings. Boundary enclosures to gardens that address public space or parking courts will also need to be constructed in brick. Conditions will be used to ensure these details are implemented.

The Surrounds

- 15.25 The approved Master Plan divides the Surrounds into the following four character areas:
- The south west area, closest to Nayland Road (Area E)
 - The north west area adjoining the northern half of Boxted Road (Area A)
 - The north central area situated between the Core and Tower Lane (Area B)

- The Northern Approaches frontage, incorporating the school, community centre and mixed use (Area C and F).

- 15.26 The layout for the Surrounds is more informal than the Core and in this respect responds to the requirements of the Design Statement. It is however unfortunate that the requirements of the Highway Authority for standard road geometry has resulted in the development having a rather engineered appearance.
- 15.27 The Design and Access Statement explains that the design rationale for the Surrounds is drawn from historical designs and the former hospital buildings, as well as drawing reference from the surrounding context such as Phase 1A and the development along Boxted Road.
- 15.28 The design proposals for Area E are based on an Arts and Craft style of architecture. This architectural response is considered acceptable for this part of site. Various design amendments have been suggested both to improve the general appearance of the proposed buildings and create a stronger sense of continuity to the streets. The design proposals for Area A and B (as originally submitted) were based on the Essex vernacular. This design response was considered to be misguided as it failed to draw on the architectural character of the existing buildings which are derived from the Arts and Crafts movement. In order to reinforce local distinctiveness Officers have recommended that the building designs for Area A draw upon the Lodge Houses and Myland Court and that the designs for Area B draw upon the former Nurses Homes and Chestnut Villa. The building designs for Area C are again based on Arts and Craft Style (which is considered appropriate). The buildings on Area F are to reflect elements of the new echelon buildings combined with detailing found on Phase 1 of the Severalls development. This design response is considered appropriate. Amendments to address the above (and other) concerns have been submitted by the applicant during the course of writing this report and others are still awaited. An update on the design issues raised will be given to Members at the committee meeting.
- 15.29 In the Surrounds, the Design Statement requires the predominant wall materials to be red brick and coloured renders and that roof coverings are to be clay tiles or slates. The submitted Design and Access Statement however proposes the use of materials more commonly associated with the Essex Vernacular rather than those found on the Severalls site. It is considered important that the materials proposed are both of a high quality and reflect those found on site to reinforce the local distinctiveness of the area. Boundary treatments (including gated enclosures) will also be of important in terms of establishing and reinforcing the character of various part of the site. Conditions will need to be attached to ensure the appropriate use of high quality materials and boundary enclosures.
- 15.30 Concern has been expressed about the use of standard house types and there adaptations. Design is more than just the aesthetics or style of the houses, and it is accepted that the modification of standard house types, as employed here, can, if properly integrated into a wider design philosophy, be an acceptable approach to good design. Thus, while the design of a proposed development can have very distinct effects on the appearance of an area, it also affects the character and the way it functions, both in relation to its location and for the future occupants.

15.31 Buildings for Life 12 (BfL 12) present a simple traffic light approach to twelve key design questions. The more 'greens' that are achieved, the better a development will be. A red light gives warning that a particular aspect of a proposed development needs to be reconsidered. Officers have carried out an assessment of the scheme, the conclusions of which are set out below:

1. Connections	Green
2. Facilities and Services	Amber to Green
3. Public transport	Amber to Green
4. Meeting local housing req.	Amber
5. Character	Amber to Red
6. Working w/site and context	Amber
7. Creating well defined streets/space	Amber to Green
8. Easy to find your way around	Green to Amber
9. Streets for All	Green
10. Car parking	Amber to Green
11. Public/private spaces	Amber
12. External storage/amenity space	Green

15.32 It is important for Members to note that the above assessment was undertaken on the original planning submission. The applicant has made various amendments to the design and layout of the scheme and, as consequence of these changes, the Amber to Green scores are likely to change to Green and the Character Amber rating could move to Amber to Green or Green (pending a full review of the amended drawings).

15.33 Whilst Officers accept that BfL12 cannot be considered as a definitive exercise the themes it sets out mirror those in Paragraph 58 of the NPPF and therefore provides a useful bench mark against which to assess a development proposal.

15.34 The need for good design is clearly articulated in both the development plan and in the NPPF. Based on the above BfL 12 assessment it is accepted that the scheme does have a number of positive attributes. It is therefore considered that, providing the amended drawings satisfiability address the design concerns raised by Officer (or these amendments are secured by condition) the current proposal is (or can be made to be) acceptable.

Heritage Issues

15.35 CS Policy ENV1 states that the Borough Council will conserve and enhance Colchester's natural and historic environment. DPD DP14 states that development will not be permitted that will adversely affect a listed building, a conservation area, historic park or garden or important archaeological remains. Government guidance on the historic environment is set out in paragraphs 126 to 141 of the NPPF. Paragraph 133 deals with substantial harm to, or total loss of significance of, a designated heritage asset. Paragraph 134 deals with less than substantial harm. Harm in this category has to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

- 15.36 The Severalls Hospital was designed by County Architect, Frank Whitmore in 1910. The asylum was laid out in an echelon style that was common at the time. The front Administration building is fine example of the Queen Anne Style building. The echelon block present a unified and formal appearance to the external parkland and a key feature of this building is the way in which it defines a series of external courts. The interior of the echelon consists of a group of widespread inter connecting elements which were dominated a large assembly hall (destroyed by fire) and two airing courts. The hospital buildings are mostly two storey brick structures with pitched tiled or slate roofs; the notable exception to this is the water tower which not only dominates the service area of the hospital but also from far creating a significant landmark. A series of more domestic villa buildings are scattered in parkland and connected by a series of sweeping drives.
- 15.37 The relevant heritage designations within the Severalls Hospital site are the grade II listed Administration Building and the grade II registered historic park and garden designation, which covers the whole of the reserved matters application site. The application site also includes various non designated heritage assets (i.e. buildings of local interest). The Ingram Report of 2001 (submitted with the outline application) stated that “as a group the hospital complex is an important and intact survival of local and national significance”. In the intervening time the complex has considerably declined in condition as a consequence of the site’s neglect.
- 15.38 The special interest of the Administration Building is derived mainly from its architectural and historic interest and makes a dignified architectural announcement to the former hospital. Originally the building would have been flanked by a two storey range on the east and a single storey range on the west, with the two storey spine extending behind it. The building-line and projecting nature of the listed building and its relationship with the main approach, including the turning circle, ensured it stood out as the principal building of the asylum complex. It is these aspects of its setting, along with the now matured landscape, that contributes in the strongest way to its significance and appreciation. To the rear of the building and has a more utilitarian appearance and is considered to be of less significance.
- 15.39 The Administration Building is to be retained (as a single dwelling house) and the Heritage Statement explains that the building has had a pivotal influence on the layout proposed for the Core. The circular lawn to the north is to be retained and the central war memorial reinstated as part of the current proposal. The existing flanking structures will be demolished and replaced by new houses that will set behind the building-line of the front elevation so as to retain the prominence of the listed building. Concern has been expressed by Officer in respect the original design of the two new flanking buildings and the applicant has agreed to consider alternative designs. At the time of writing this report revised details have not been reviewed. The proposed rear garden to the administration building is shown enclosed by a brick wall with an in / out vehicular access on the south boundary fronting the central square area on the spine road. It is considered that the proposal (subject to improvement to the design of the flanking buildings) would cause harm in relation to the setting of this listed building but this this harm would be minimal.
- 15.40 The proposed development will have a significant impact on the designated historic park and garden both as a result of demolition of historic buildings and the infilling of areas of existing parkland.

- 15.41 The submitted Heritage Statement accepts that the by implementing the development approved by the extant outline planning permission and in the form shown on the approved 2011 Master Plan will result in fundamental changes to overall character of the designated landscape. The Heritage Statement however opines that because the current reserved matters application broadly follows the masterplan it does not cause further substantial harm to the registered park and, as such, paragraph 133 of the NPPF is not engaged. Officers do not agree with this view, particularly as the NPPF was published after the Master Plan was approved and the guidance is a material consideration against which planning applications have to be assessed. That said, whilst the issue of substantial harm as outlined in the NPPF cannot be ignored, it is accepted that for the purposes of this application, the baseline is the approved Master Plan. (In the event that any future application is submitted that is not pursuant to the outline permission, the new development proposal will need to be considered on its own merit and this will need to include a fresh assessment of its impact on the identified heritage assets).
- 15.42 The significant harm caused by the developments outlined in the 2011 Master Plan result from the substantial demolition of the historic buildings and the further encroachment into area of open parkland. These changes were accepted by the Council on the basis that they would enable the site to be brought forward for development and would secure the conversion and reuse of the reduced number of retained hospital buildings. Given this, it is considered important to link the new build element to the repair and conversion of the retained hospital buildings either through a condition related to occupation triggers or the phased demolition of the hospital buildings. It is also considered important that the hospital buildings are properly recorded prior to their demolition.
- 15.43 When the current application is assessed against the approved Master Plan, there is strong conformity between the application proposal and Master Plan. There are however some areas of deviation but the Heritage Statement notes that these are primarily due to the proposals being informed by an up-to-date tree survey. Key landscape areas identified within the approved Design Statement (namely the kidney route, the dormer cricket pitch, Myland Gardens, the memorial lawn, the internal and external airing courts and woodland blocks and shelter belts) are being retained and enhanced as part of the current proposal. Given the extant planning framework for this site, it is considered that that the development proposals generally respond in a positive and a pragmatic way the requirements of the Master Plan and the existing site constraints.
- 15.44 For the reasons given above, and having paid special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building and its setting and given careful consideration to the requirement of paragraphs 131 - 134 of the NPPF, it is considered that this application is acceptable in terms of its heritage impact.

Trees and Landscape

- 15.45 Policy ENV1 states that the Borough Council will conserve and enhance Colchester's natural and historic environment, countryside and coastline.

- 15.46 The landscape setting to the hospital forms both a significant historical asset and the primary constraint to the delivery of the scheme. The original 2001 outline planning application was supported by a tree survey and identified trees for retention. Since this document was produced the trees have continued to grow and a significant number of new saplings have set.
- 15.47 A new tree survey for the whole site has been submitted in support of this application. A total of 914 individual trees, 56 groups of trees, 114 areas of trees and one woodland were identified during the survey. It is apparent from the submitted survey that the majority of trees were planted at the time of the Hospital's construction (i.e. in the early 1900's). The tree population therefore has a relatively even aged cohort. Some older trees do exist (old field and hedgerow trees); similarly more recent institutional planting exists mostly along the curving road to the south of the central core. The Tree Report also notes that the landscape stock has not been maintained for many years allowing the survival of many poorer trees and in large areas natural regeneration has occurred. The Council's Arboricultural Officer has confirmed that he is in broad agreement with the conclusions submitted Tree Survey.
- 15.48 The proposed development will result in the loss of a significant number of trees. The vast majority of these trees have been categorised as C (trees that should not constrain development) or R (trees that should be felled). The current proposals will however result in the 4 A items being felled and 110 B items being felled.
- 15.49 Both the Arboricultural Officer and Landscape Officer have played an integral part in shaping the form of the proposed development to ensure that tree loss is kept to the absolute minimum. Justification has been sought for the all Category A and B tree removal. In each case the applicant has had to demonstrate why the trees are considered to be incompatible with the layout of the proposed development. The reasons put forward include: the approved Master Plan shows roads running through woodland blocks rendering it impossible to retain trees, some trees are too large for modern domestic gardens or in the case of a Category A Oak tree it is too close the retained ward block. Whilst the loss of important trees is regrettable, it is important to remember that there will be significant new tree planting which has been designed to reinforce the historic landscape structure and will provide succession planting to a declining age stock.
- 15.50 The submitted Arboricultural Assessment highlights the fact that there will be considerable importance placed on the necessity to appoint and authorise an Arboricultural Monitoring Consultant during the implementation stage of the development. This will need to be the subject of a condition
- 15.51 The Arboricultural Officer has also provided advice on the relationship between trees and the proposed buildings so as to avoid potential future complaints in respect of nuisance and shading. To this end, a shading analysis has been requested at three locations of concern. The shading analysis has shown that three units falls below the minimum acceptable lighting level and an alternative design solution has been requested from the applicant in respect of these units.

- 15.52 The submitted Design and Access Statement explains that the landscape proposal seeks to preserve and where appropriate restore the key elements that underpin the historic listing. In addition to the restoration of existing landscape features substantial new tree planting is proposed. This includes avenue planting to the spine road and the central north / south boulevard (within the Core) and new areas of buffer planting to the edges of the site. In terms of the wider visual impact, it is considered that the proposed development will have minimal impact due to the topography of the land and the visual enclosure provided by existing trees and development.
- 15.53 The Landscape Officer has confirmed that that he is content with the submitted Landscape Strategy as a 'concept' proposal. The Planning Statement suggests that it may be appropriate to discharge the landscaping condition (34) at least in part. The Landscape Officer has advised that the submitted details are not sufficient for either the full or partial discharge of this condition.
- 15.54 Overall, it is considered that the landscaping proposal will enhance existing landscape features and that this will help to create a high quality and locally distinctive landscape and public realm setting for the new development. The landscaping proposals are therefore considered to accord with local planning policies and the NPPF.

Public Open Space, Play Areas and Private Amenity Space

- 15.55 CS Policy PR1 states that the Council aims to provide a network of open spaces, and recreational opportunities that meet local community needs. DPD Policy DP16 sets down criterion (size of gardens) that should be provided within new residential developments. In addition to private amenity space, DP16 requires all new residential development to provide new public areas of accessible strategic or local open space. Precise levels of provision will depend on the location of the proposal and the nature of open space needs in the area but as a guideline, at least 10% of the gross site area should be provided as useable open space.
- 15.56 The architect has advised that, with the exception of two plots (plots 14 and 21 on Area D3) all of the gardens to the dwelling houses comply with the Council's adopted standards. The reason for plots 14 and 21 not complying is because officers have requested a greater separation between the existing mature tree and this terrace of properties.
- 15.57 The apartment buildings are provided with a small communal garden; in addition to this, the majority of the apartment units also have a large private balcony. The applicant acknowledges that the apartment buildings do not meet the requisite private amenity area for flats. They have however explained that the flats are set within or are very close to substantial areas of public open space and that this justifies the reduction in private amenity space. Officers would not necessarily disagree with this view.
- 15.58 The proposed development provides for a total of 23 hectares of open space and woodland. The areas of open space and woodland conforms to areas shown on Plan 11 attached to the s106 agreement for this development, albeit the configuration of these spaces have been amended to allow for a better form of development.

- 15.59 The submitted play and recreation strategy shows the proposed range of children's recreational opportunities on site and the coverage provided. It highlights that the majority of the new dwellings will be adequately located within a maximum of 5 minutes' walk or 400m from the nearest Locally Equipped Area of Play (LEAP). Additionally, the majority of the dwellings will be located within the 1km of an area of play specifically designed to cater for the needs of older, teenage children, who can be expected to walk a little further to reach a designated facility.
- 15.60 The strategic open space is over and above the 10% gross site area required by DPD 16. With regard to private amenity space, the proposal do not fully conform to the requirement of policy DP16, however the conflict is limited and is not considered to constitute a sufficient reason for refusal.

Ecology and Biodiversity

- 15.61 CS Policy ENV1 states that the Borough Council will conserve and enhance Colchester's natural and historic environment. DPD Policy DP21 seeks to conserve or enhance biodiversity. The policy places stringent requirements on supporting ecological information being provided to demonstrate the degree of impact or harm (especially in relation to designated sites or species), the associated mitigation measures and measures to enhance biodiversity.
- 15.62 An extended habitat survey was included as a part of the outline planning application and ecology was a topic covered by the Environmental Statement. The Environmental Impact Assessment provided an assessment of the base-line conditions across the sites, predicted impacts were identified and mitigation measures suggested. The surveys revealed that a number of the buildings housed a bat population and one building was used by Barn Owls. The ecological reports noted that three species of bat were evident within the site and commented that the scale of redevelopment, together with the loss of flight lines with the adjacent Cuckoo Farm development, would have a high negative impact on the bat population unless appropriate mitigation measures are implemented. To this end, two were attached to the outline planning approval requiring further details of mitigation measures (including methodology, timescale for completion and long term maintenance and monitoring plan) in respect of bats, barn owls and wax cap fungi (condition 44) and an investigative survey to be undertaken to establish the presence of invertebrates (condition 43)
- 15.63 The ecology assessment and mitigation strategy submitted with the current application considers both the historical data collected from 2001 and range of targeted update surveys conducted in 2015. This report opines that the process of targeted survey driving mitigation and enhancement has focused an ecologically led master planning process. The report goes on to state that the retention of the site's important green infrastructure and enhanced sensitive landscaping will provide a mosaic of valuable habitats for identified ecological receptors as well as biodiversity in general.
- 15.64 Both Natural England and the Council's Ecological Consult (ECCOS) have advised that the submitted survey work is incomplete and, as such, the Council as the planning authority will not have sufficient information to determine the application. Following discussions with Natural England and ECCOS further ecological survey work and reports have been submitted (22 Feb 2016) for consideration. At the time of writing this report comments are still awaited from both Natural England and ECCOS.

- 15.65 With regard to the need to comply with the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 in respect of nesting birds etc., the applicant has advised that they intend to start removing the trees identified removal on the AMA Tree Survey the week commencing 21 March 2016. Officers have not raised an objection to these works as it is considered prudent for these trees to be removed before the start of the main bird nesting season.
- 15.66 Large sites can by their nature present a greater challenge in seeking to comply with the Environmental Assessment Regulations 2011. This is particularly case where the scheme is for a redevelopment of site that will be implemented over several years. The Regulations require that sufficient information is submitted to enable the “main” or likely significant” effects on the environment to be assessed and the mitigation measures to be described. It is for the local planning authority to decide whether it is satisfied, given the nature of the project in question, that it has full knowledge of its likely effects on the environment. If it considers that an unnecessary degree of flexibility and hence uncertainty as to the likely significant environmental effects, has been incorporated into the description of the development, then it can require more detail, or refuse consent. It is thus a planning judgment as to the adequacy of the ecological information submitted, having regard to the law.
- 15.67 It is considered that the ecological information with the additional material is sufficient to enable a determination of the reserved matters application. Whilst the information is sufficient to enable the reserved matters application to granted approval, the details submitted are not currently considered sufficient to enable the discharge of conditions 43 and 44 of the outline planning permission and further work is ongoing.

Residential Amenity

- 15.68 DPD DP1 states that all development must be designed to a high standard and avoid unacceptable impacts on amenity. Part III of this policy seeks to protect existing public and residential amenity, particularly with regard to privacy, overlooking, security, noise and disturbance, pollution (including light and odour pollution), daylight and sunlight. The adopted Essex Design Guide also provides guidance on the protection of residential private amenity.
- 15.69 The application site is for the most part bounded by existing roads or commercial / leisure development. Residential properties do however back onto the triangular site accessed from Mill Road and residential properties face the west boundary of the site (formed by Boxted Road). It is considered that the residential properties located on Boxted Road are sufficient distance from the proposed new housing for the new development not to adversely their residential amenity. With regard to the property located on Mill Road, the proposed new dwellings are located 38m from the site boundary and have a front to back distance of some 48m. There is also an existing shelter belt of trees between proposed houses and the existing dwellings. Given the degree of separation between the house and the intervening screening it is not considered that the proposed development will have a significant adverse impact of the private amenity of the existing Mill Road residents.

- 15.70 Concern has been raised by some local residents that the proposed development would have a detrimental impact on their local amenity, in terms of construction noise and disturbance. During construction there would be some adverse impacts and these would continue throughout the course of the development. Planning conditions attached to the outline planning permission to mitigate the impact of construction activity. It should be noted that Environmental Control has not raised any fundamental concerns regarding the potential for noise pollution from construction activity and/or vehicular traffic and that the Environmental Protection Act provides a variety of safeguards in respect of noise, air and light pollution.
- 15.71 Condition 3 part (b) requires details of sound attenuation / noise mitigation measures to be submitted before or concurrently with the submission of reserved matters for each phase. The updated Noise Assessment has been submitted to the Council which provides noise modelling (taking into account future growth and predicted traffic flows) and recommends noise mitigation measures. Environmental Protection has confirmed that the noise readings taken provide sufficient information and noise mitigation measures are acceptable (provided the scheme is implemented in full accordance with them). Given this, it is that the requirements of Condition 3, Part B of decision 151401 can be met and the condition discharged
- 15.72 For the reasons given, it is considered that there is no conflict with the intentions of the development plan or the Framework in respect of residential amenity and neighbourliness.

Transport and Accessibility

- 15.73 CS Policy TA1 – TA4 seeks to improve accessibility and change travel behaviour. DPD Policy DP17 states that all developments should seek to enhance accessibility for sustainable modes of transport by giving priority to pedestrians, cycling and public transport access. Paragraphs 29 to 41 of the NPPF provide guidance on transportation matters.
- 15.74 The access details onto Boxted Road and the access onto VUR have been submitted as a part of the reserved matters application. The access arrangement from Nayland Road and Mill Road are the subject of a separate full application. The reason for this is that the land area required to facilitate the new junctions extends beyond the original site boundary of the outline planning approval.
- 15.75 The main vehicular access to the former Severalls hospital site was from Boxted Road. It is proposed to upgrade this junction as a part of the current development proposal. The principal access has already been constructed off the VUR to the east of the site to deliver the new primary school facility. These two access points are to be linked to provide the main spine road through the development. The spine road has been designed to accommodate a bus service (for the development and connecting to the wider area). The positions of the bus stops are indicated on the submitted drawings. A new access is to be created onto Nayland Road to serve the southern part of the site (Area E). This access will require a designated right hand turn which will need localised widening. The small pocket of development located to the south of VUR is to be served Mill Road access will need limited modifications to the existing carriageway

- 15.76 The main vehicular access points into site are the same as that proposed within the 2011 approved Masterplan. The Highway Authority has advised that they have no objection to the access arrangements and are satisfied that there would be no unacceptable adverse impact on the safety or free flow of traffic on the road network.
- 15.77 The concerns expressed about the traffic implications of a development of this scale are fully appreciated. Indeed it is understandable in the circumstances, that a single development proposal to construct up to additional 730 dwellings is perceived as too much for the community to absorb. It is however important to remember that outline planning approval has already been granted for this development and a series mitigation measures (conditions and s106 obligations) have already been secured to mitigate the highway impacts of this development. It is also important to note that the overall dwelling numbers have been reduced from 1,500 to 1000 dwellings and that this will result in a corresponding reduction in vehicular movements.
- 15.78 The scheme proposes a hierarchy of movement that follows the principles in the approved Master Plan. The road hierarchy and street dimensions are in accordance with the emerging highway standards. The street hierarchy allows for a permeable form of development that allows pedestrians and cyclists to move freely and safely through the development. The scheme also integrates fully with the adjacent highway networks and includes improvements to pedestrian and cycle links along Boxted Road and Nayland Road. New links are also provided to Tower Lane (a PRow), which is to be upgraded to a pedestrian cycle route as a part of the Severalls Hospital proposal. Comments made from the Council's Transportation Manager and ECC have (where feasible) been incorporated within the revised design layout.
- 15.79 It is not considered that this proposal would have a severe impact on the local highway network in terms of capacity or safety. Moreover, the scheme provides for the enhancement of sustainable modes of transport by giving priority to pedestrian and cyclists. In view of this, it is considered that the proposed development would accord with relevant development plan policies and national planning policy guidance set out in the NPPF.

Parking

- 15.80 Policy TA5 of the CS refers to parking and states that development proposals should manage parking to accord with the accessibility of the location and to ensure people friendly street environments. DPD policy DP19 states that the Council will refer developers to the Essex Planning Officers Association (EPOA) Vehicle Parking Standards which was adopted by Colchester Borough Council as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) in November 2009.
- 15.81 The adopted 2009 guidance document requires a minimum of one car parking space for each one-bedroom dwelling and two spaces for each dwelling with two or more bedrooms. In addition to this, there is a requirement to provide visitor parking at a ratio of one visitor space per 4 dwellings.

- 15.82 Applying the adopted standards to the development mix (comprising 36 with one-bedroom dwellings and 694 with two or more bedrooms dwellings) a total of 1424 allocated spaces are required. With regard to unallocated visitor spaces, a total of 183 spaces are required ($730 \times .025$). The architect has advised that the current application proposes a total of 1670 allocated and 192 unallocated car parking spaces, creating an average of 2.55 per household. This figure exceeds the 2.5 minimum space requirements as set out by the adopted parking standards.
- 15.83 The minimum cycle standard is one secure parking space for each dwelling without a garage. The submitted drawings indicate that the cycle parking provision will be provided in accordance with adopted standards through a combination of policy compliant garages, garden sheds (for those without garages) and for apartments secure stores located adjacent to the entrance for each block.
- 15.84 Given the proximity of Western Homes Community Stadium it is likely that visitors or supporters to this or other attractions would seek to park for free on the internal estate roads were no controls put in place. The Design and Access Statement states that it is proposed introduce daytime controls via a controlled parking zone (CPC). These details fall outside the scope of planning and will need to be advance with the Highway Authority as a part of the roads adoption process.

Hydrology and Drainage

- 15.85 CS policy ENV1 sets out the strategic policy approach to safeguard people and property from the risk of flooding. ENV1 seeks to direct new development towards sites with the lowest risk from flooding and promotes the use of flood mitigation measures (SUDS) to help manage risk. DPD DP20 supports development proposals that include flood mitigation/ attenuation measures as well as flood resilience measures.
- 15.86 The issues of drainage and the potential for flood risk were fully considered as a part of the outline application. To ensure that these matters were dealt with expediently condition 1 part d of the outline planning approval requires details of foul and surface water drainage to be approved
- 15.87 The Drainage Strategy states that the proposals have been developed in consultation with ECC and Anglian Water and have been devised to take into account the constraints imposed by the large number of retained TPO trees within the site.
- 15.88 The LLFA has raised an objection to the proposals on the grounds of predicted runoff rates, water quality treatment and Urban Creep (allowance of up to 10%). The Drainage Consultant has responded to the issues raised. The LLAF has accepted the additional information regarding the proposed run off rates and has accepted a reduced Urban Creep level of 3% based on permitted development rights being removed. (At the time of writing this report the LLAF has not confirmed that submitted Drainage Strategy caters for 3% Urban Creep). With regard to water quality treatment, whilst the LLAF accept that SuDS treatment may not be possible given the site constraints, they have advised that alternative treatment should be provided using proprietary features such as petrol interceptors, with an explanation given as to how their treatment efficiency would appropriately address the pollution potential of the roads. There is currently uncertainty as whether Anglian Water will allow Petrol

Interceptors or roadside swales/filter strips etc. to connect to the adoptable drainage system. Officers are currently seeking clarification from Anglian Water on this issue; however it is the understanding of officers that it is not Anglian Water policy to allow petrol interceptors to flow into their adopted system.

- 15.89 The foul flows from the proposed development will discharge to the foul sewer built as part of the NAR3 works. Two foul connection points to the NAR3 foul sewer have been provided along the south eastern boundary of the site to allow foul connection from the Severalls site. The development will be split into two separate catchments, equivalent to the surface water catchment areas and drained via S104 piped sewers. In respect of foul water drainage, Anglian Water has not raised an objection.

Compliance with S106 Requirements

Affordable Housing

- 15.90 The s106 legal agreement requires that 15% of the units on Phase 2 are provided as affordable housing. The agreement also requires the reserved matters application to be supported by an Affordable Housing Scheme and an Affordable Housing Tenure Scheme. The Affordable Housing Scheme requires amongst other items details of the number, location, area (both internal floor space and overall footprint) for each affordable unit and the proportion provided in the phase and/or sub phase. The Tenure Scheme requires details to be provided of the tenure mix between the affordable rented and intermediate units, details of the Registered Provider and a programme of construction and delivery.
- 15.91 The planning submission accords with this requirement to provide 15% affordable housing. The information submitted in support of this application is also considered broadly sufficient in terms of the Affordable Housing Scheme requirements. The applicant has advised that whilst they have had preliminary discussions with Registered Providers regarding the delivery of affordable housing on this site they have not as yet formally appointed a Registered Provider. No detailed information has been submitted on the tenure mix or the affordable housing programme of construction and delivery. The applicant has been advised that these details either need to be submitted or it will be necessary to amend the existing provisions the s106 agreement.
- 15.92 In respect of the points raised by the Housing Development Officer the agent has responded as follows:
- The affordable housing has been located across the development working with the intended character areas established at the outline stage. Many of the smaller units such as the 1 and 2 bedroom apartments are located close to The Core of the development in the higher density areas such as Area D and the frontage of the VUR. Clusters of affordable do not exceed 15 dwellings. The main change in the revised scheme is to relocate some of the affordable in Area B to locate the affordable away from the bridle path edge.
 - Dwellings such as 2-beds have been increased to comply with HQL standards with the majority of 3-bed dwellings capable of 5-person occupation as requested.

- The 3 affordable bungalows are provided and these meet part M in full.

15.93 There is much uncertainty in affordable housing provision at present as a result of changes at national level. At the time of writing this report, the Housing Development Officer has advised that issues surrounding proportional mix and tenure mix remain outstanding. It also needs to be demonstrated that the three affordable bungalows fully comply with category 3 Part of the Buildings. At the time of writing this report, amended details of the bungalow have not been submitted. A verbal update will be given.

Allotments

15.94 The S106 requires a site of not less than 0.72 hectares to be provided for Allotments. The application submission includes the provision for allotments in accordance with this requirement in the locations identified on the approved Masterplan.

Community Building

15.95 The S106 provides for a 0.4 hectare area to provide a Community Building. This area remains allocated for future community use and therefore is excluded from the current reserved matters submission. The community facility will be delivered under separate consent.

Play Areas

15.96 The S106 sets out the need for 12 LAPs (one of which 1 has already been provided at Phase 1); four LEAPs (one has already been provided at Phase 1); one NEAP and one Wheel Facility. The locations of the NEAP, Leaps and Wheeled Play Facility are shown on the submitted landscape strategy. The location and extent of the LAPS will be shown on a plan to be submitted and an update will be provided on this issue.

Mixed Use

15.97 The S106 provides for an area to provide a Mixed Use scheme. This area remains allocated for mixed-use in accordance with the approved Masterplan and is excluded from the current reserved matters submission.

Open Space

15.98 The S106 sets out a requirement to provide a total 6.06 hectares of open space across the Severalls Hospital site. This application provides 5.39 hectares of open space; this is in addition to the open space provided on Phase 1

War Memorial

15.99 The S106 requires the relocation of the War Memorial to an area identified on the approved Masterplan. The submitted scheme shows the reinstatement of the War Memorial.

Woodland

15.100 The S106 requires retention of c 9.9 hectares of Woodland within the site. This application proposes 10.56 hectare of woodland.

16.0 Conclusions

- 16.1 The current application will deliver 730 residential units and provide a choice of housing types with a range of prices (including 15% affordable housing) in a sustainable location. The development will contribute positively towards the Borough's supply of housing. There would be economic benefits as a result of construction activity, continuing the regeneration of the former Severalls Hospital site and the possible creation of additional jobs. There is sufficient evidence to be confident that overall the development would not cause significant harm to flood risk, noise pollution or would not have a severe impact upon the highway network; in terms of capacity or safety. The proposal will also provide sports, recreational and education and community facilities in this part of Borough. A financial contribution of £2m is also to be made for the delivery of the busway. The Framework has at its heart the promotion of sustainable development. The proposal has significant sustainability credentials
- 16.2 A core planning principle of the Framework is to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations. Weighing against the proposal is, first, the substantial harm to the established character and appearance of the grounds of the Severalls Hospital site, which are designated a grade II historic park and garden and the loss of a significant number of non-designated heritage assets. The context for this application has however been set by decisions that were taken prior to the publication of the NPPF. When the proposal is judged against the approved Master Plan it is seen to be substantially in accordance with this plan. The scheme would result in a heritage impact equating to less than substantial harm to the significance of the Administration Building (paragraph 134 NPPF), which is statutorily listed at grade II. This impact is considered to be balanced by the public benefits of the scheme. The lack of a comprehensive update bat survey also weighs against this proposal. It is however recognised that the scheme does offer the potential for ecological and biodiversity mitigation and enhancement in the long-term
- 16.3 In conclusion, it is considered that the benefits of the scheme significantly outweigh by any adverse impacts and, as such, Members are asked to endorse the officer recommendation that, subject to the outstanding issues highlighted in this report, the the Head of Commercial Services be authorised under delegated powers to grant reserved matters planning approval subject to the condition heads set out below.

17.0 Recommendation

Application 152733

It is recommended that subject to the outstanding issues highlighted in this report that the Head of Service be authorised under delegated powers to grant reserved matters planning approval subject to the following heads:

- Time Reserved Matters Applications (standard)
- Development to Accord With Approved Plans (standard)
- Amendment to specified plots / house types to address design issues(non stanard)
- Materials referred to in DAS Excluded (non-standard)
- Architectural detailing (non-standard)
- Front boundary treatment in the Core to be brick or brick & railings unless agreed (non-standard)
- Boundary enclosures to rear / side garden that front a public / semi-public space to be brick (non-standard)
- Tree protection and monitoring (non-standard)
- Highway amendments requested by HA (non-standard)
- No occupation until Boxted Road entrance completed
- Roads designed to 20mph details of traffic calming to be agreed (non-standard)
- Occupation trigger for the completion of the spine road. (non-standard)
- Estate Carriageway Construction linked to relevant occupation (standard)
- Parking space available / retained prior to occupation (non-standard)
- No construction traffic to use the entrance by the school at school opening / closing times(non-standard)
- Trigger point related to the repair / refurbishment of the retained buildings (non-standard)
- Recording of historic hospital buildings (non-standard)
- Informative controlled parking zone (non-standard)

Application 152794

Grant planning approval subject to the following heads:

- Time
- Development in accordance with approved plans
- No occupation until access has been completed
- Landscaping Details and Monitoring
- Tree Protection and Monitoring
- Construction Method Statement

18.0 Informatives

(1) ZT0 – Advisory Note on Construction & Demolition

The developer is referred to the attached advisory note Advisory Notes for the Control of Pollution during Construction & Demolition Works for the avoidance of pollution during the demolition and construction works. Should the applicant require any further guidance they should contact Environmental Control prior to the commencement of the works.

(2) All works affecting the highway should be carried out by prior arrangement with, and to the requirements and satisfaction of, the Highway Authority and application for the necessary works should be made by initially telephoning 08456 037631.

(3) **ZTA - Informative on Conditions Stating Prior to Commencement/Occupation**

PLEASE NOTE that this permission contains a condition precedent that requires details to be agreed and/or activity to be undertaken either before you commence the development or before you occupy the development. This is of critical importance. If you do not comply with the condition precedent you may invalidate this permission. Please pay particular attention to these requirements.

19.0 Positivity Statement

- 19.1 The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework