

## Officers Report for KET/2017/0615

### 3.0 Information

#### Relevant Planning History

None

#### Site Visit

Officer's site inspection was carried out on 18/09/2017

#### Site Description

The 0.93ha site comprises a rectangular piece of grassland outside the northern extent of the village with boundary hedging. There is established residential development to the east and south and a progressing housing development to the west. To the north is a ribbon of grassland with the A43 beyond.

#### Pre-application

The application was subject to pre-application advice under reference PRE/2016/0039 for 26 dwellings where the Officer advised that primarily because of the sites location outside the village boundary the application is likely to be refused and should instead be promoted through the progressing Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan (SSP2).

#### Proposed Development

The application seeks outline planning permission, with all matters reserved, for up to twenty dwellings. The indicative plan that accompanies the application shows an access off Grange Road with a mix of detached and semi-detached dwellings, some with detached garages arranged around an F-shaped cul-de-sac and includes the provision of six affordable houses.

#### Any Constraints Affecting the Site

Within the open countryside

Within the setting of a Conservation Area

### 4.0 Consultation and Customer Impact

**Broughton Parish Council:** *Objection* stated for the following summarised reasons:

- Outside village confines and thereby contrary to development plan policy that seek a sustainable pattern of growth and protection of the rural areas – the Council has five years of housing land supply
- Harm to character and appearance of the area – *urbanising effect*
- Harm caused to the setting of the Conservation Area
- Adverse impact to existing residents due to the increased amount of traffic
- Existing roads not suitable for the increased amount of traffic
- Unacceptable grouping of refuse bins in one location on the site
- Insufficient parking provision
- Similar type of development to a nearby application that was recently refused

at Bentham Close

- Unwarranted demolition of an existing bungalow
- No over-riding factors that would permit development outside village boundary - to permit would set a precedent
- Various factual inaccuracies in the submitted design and access statement and transport statement

**KBC Housing Development:** Make the following summarised comments:

- The proposal should provide 8 affordable units and not 6
- The provision of 3 and 2 bed houses is acceptable
- Generally a tenure split for the affordable units would be 70% market rent and 30% shared ownership although an even 50/50 even split may be considered
- The developers have experience of dealing with affordable home providers

**KBC Environmental Protection: Object;** on the basis of the proposal not meeting the requirements of British Noise Standards with the mitigation measure proposed would require the windows to be closed

**NCC – Local Highway Authority:** Say that they require *further information* with the following summarised comments:

- The new road needs to be to adoptable standard with junction visibility shown on the plan
- Visibility at the access is poor
- No vertical features allowed
- A swept path analysis should be provided
- Consideration should be given to the provision of street lighting
- Parking arrangements and amount is not appropriate
- A contribution of £20,000 will be required for calming works on Kettering Road
- Further information is required for the Grange Road and whether it is of sufficient standard to cope with the development. The viability of the turning head at the entry to the site also needs to be assessed.
- Each householder should be offered a 28 day buss pass
- The provision of a bus shelter should be explored

**NCC – Development Management:** Say that based on the housing mix proposed the development would be expected to provide £81,424 toward Early Years infrastructure, £77,448 toward Primary Education, £94,372 toward Secondary Education, £4,900 toward Libraries and the provision of one fire hydrant

**NCC – Archaeology:** *No objection* stated

**NCC – Ecology:** *No objection* subject to the imposition of conditions requiring the proposal to be implemented in accordance with the submitted ecological report and a tree protection plan but noting the lack of an arboricultural survey

**Northamptonshire Police’s Crime Prevention Design Advisor (CPDA):** Say that

the development should recognise surveillance, security and lighting measures and exposure of boundaries in the reserved matters

**Historic England:** *No comment* stated saying that the relevant local archaeology and conservation specialist should be deferred to

**Neighbours:** Nineteen third party letters of **objection** received from nearby residents for much the same reasons as those raised by the Parish Council and on the following summarised grounds:

- Cumulative harm caused to highway safety on the A43 and Village roads when considered together with other recent permissions
- The Banks is a poorly lit unmade route for users of the site
- Any further development should be delivered through the emerging Neighbourhood Plan
- If approved the development should look to retain boundary hedging, provide bungalows and possible routes to The Banks should be dealt with
- The village school and the GP's surgery is at capacity
- Harm to wildlife in particular to birds of prey and bats
- Loss of trees that currently act as windbreak
- Loss of a natural buffer between the adjacent Redrow development and Grange Road
- The sewerage system may not be able to cope
- Loss of a field available for pastoral farming
- Harm to the character and appearance of the site and the area including views experienced from the adjacent footpath
- Too dense
- The application over relies on the Local Plan part II which is un-adopted
- The Village's bus service is not frequent
- No need for more new houses in the village

## **5.0 Planning Policy**

### **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):**

Core Principles

Chapter 4 – Promoting sustainable transport

Chapter 6 – Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes

Chapter 7 – Requiring good design

Chapter 8 – Promoting healthy communities

Chapter 10 – Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Chapter 11 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Chapter 12 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

### **Development Plan Policies**

#### **North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS) Policies:**

1. Presumption in favour of sustainable development
2. Historic environment
3. Landscape character

- 4. Biodiversity and geodiversity
  - 5. Water environment
  - 6. Development on brownfield land and land affected by contamination
  - 8. Place shaping
  - 9. Sustainable buildings
  - 11. The network of urban and rural areas
  - 13. Rural exceptions
  - 15. Well-connected towns, villages and neighbourhoods
  - 16. Connecting the network of settlements
  - 28. Housing requirements
  - 29. Distribution of new homes
  - 30. Housing mix and tenure
- Appendix 4 – the assessment of housing land supply relative to the requirements of JCS Policy 28

**Saved Policies in the Local Plan (LP) for Kettering Borough:**

- 7 – Environment: Protection of the open countryside
- RA5 – Housing in the open countryside

**Other Documents:**

- Broughton Conservation Area Appraisal (April 2014)
- Broughton Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 16 – Submission version document (September 2017)
- Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan – Preparation stage

**6.0 Financial/Resource Implications**

Details of the contributions sought by NCC are detailed above; in addition local contributions would also be sought. The application was accompanied by a draft Section 106 agreement that indicated a willingness to make a contribution to Primary and Secondary education, Fire and Rescue, Community Facilities, Open Space, Libraries and monitoring. The indicative layout also shows provision for six affordable houses.

**7.0 Planning Considerations**

The key issues for consideration in this application are:-

- 1. The principle of the development
- 2. Impact on the character and appearance of the area
- 3. Impact on residential amenities
- 4. Impact on the safety and convenience of the highway
- 5. Impact on flooding and sewerage provision
- 6. Impact on ecology
- 7. Impact on trees and hedgerow
- 8. Impact on archaeology
- 9. Community infrastructure and affordable housing provision
- 10. Benefits
- 11. Planning Balance

## 1. The principle of the development

Planning law require applications for planning permission to be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Development Plan consists of the Saved Policies of the Local Plan and the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS), with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) a significant material consideration. Other material considerations include the Planning Practice Guidance, Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance, and supporting reports and strategies.

The SSP2 and Broughton Neighbourhood Plan are not currently at a stage where significant weight can be attributed, although the latter document has been formally submitted to the Council and is currently the subject to 6 weeks public consultation.

*Development Plan:* The site is defined as 'open countryside' by the current Kettering Borough Local Plan and thereby is considered under saved policies 7 and RA5. Those policies seek to severely restrict development within rural areas. The proposal (given its scale and nature) would not meet the tests of the JCS's open countryside exception policy 13 or the exception criteria laid out in the LP Policies. In addition, because of the sites designation the development would also not accord with the strategic aims for the Boroughs rural areas as laid out in JCS policies 1, 11 and 29. Those JCS policies encourage a plan led sustainable pattern of growth that protects rural areas. By virtue of the proposed scale, nature and location of the proposal would also not accord with policy 8 of the JCS in terms of the sites intrinsic open countryside visual amenity value.

Therefore, the principle of the development is contrary to the two components of the Development Plan. As such, in accordance with planning law, planning permission should be refused unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this case, a material consideration to which significant weight has been applied is the NPPF:

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF): The golden thread running through the Government's policy document is the presumption in favour of sustainable development and advises that for decision making this means. *'Approving development that accords with the development plan without delay and where a development plan is absent, silent or out of date, granting permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the NPPF, or if the policies in the NPPF advise against it.'* (Para 14).

The NPPF states Local Plan policies for supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if a Local Planning Authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites (Para 49). It is considered that as the Borough can provide a five year supply of housing; the Local Plan and the JCS is up-to-date.

The Council's current five year housing supply position was recently scrutinised in under cross examination in a Public Inquiry Appeal by the Inspector with regard to a site at Willowbrook Stud Farm, Rushton Road, Desborough, Kettering NN14 2QN under local reference KET/2015/0978 and Appeal reference; APP/L2820/W/16/3149835 for up to 147 dwellings. The Appeal decision was issued on the 16<sup>th</sup> June 2017 and concluded that *the Council can demonstrate a housing*

*supply in the region of 5.7 years including a 5% buffer.* This figure is broadly consistent with the findings of the North Northamptonshire Authorities' Monitoring Report (AMR) 2015/16 – Assessment of Housing Land Supply (2017-22) dated April 2017 which identified 5.53 years of housing supply.

The Inspector in her deliberations considered the base housing land requirements (including windfall allowance), size of the buffer, lapse rate, deliverable supply (including at the SUE's of Kettering East, Rothwell and Desborough North and in the context of the Kettering Town Centre Area Action Plan) and disputed sites with planning permission. In addition the Inspector gave limited weight to the emerging SSP 2 sites. The progression of the SSP 2 today has not changed significantly from the time it was considered in the Appeal. The ability of the Council to demonstrate over 5 years of housing land supply played a major tilt when the Inspector was dealing with the Planning Balance and did not find in favour of the appellants in the Balance when factoring in the benefits that would be associated with up to 147 dwellings. Notably the benefits associated with 147 dwellings would be more substantial than those associated with the proposed 20 dwellings here.

In short given that this appeal decision was made less than five months ago with the circumstances surrounding that decision largely unchanged this decision is a relevant material consideration when determining this application especially given its robust nature. Importantly the SUE's considered by the Inspector continue to progress well together with other sizeable sites within the Borough, particularly in Burton Latimer for 100+ houses, that are currently under construction.

In any event, irrespective of the District's current five year supply of housing position the development of the site would result in a form of un-sustainable development and therefore is inconsistent with the key thrust of the NPPF for seeking a sustainable pattern of growth.

The 'in principle' matter is tackled in the applicants 'Planning Design and Access Statement' dated July 2017 that accompanied the application. This document relies on identifying the site as *a sustainable and logical site for residential development meeting a need* and mentions the sites possible inclusion in Local Plan part II and drawing attention to the neighbouring Redrow Homes development that has *materially altered the appearance and form of this part of the village.*

By way of response; given that Local Plan Part II is in its early stages of adoption there is no reasonable level of certainty that the site will be included in the Development Plan. An approach that allowed development contrary to adopted development plan policy and where it may or may not be included in the site specific plan at an unknown future time date would be mis-guided and not consistent with the Plan-led approach which steers development to its most sustainable settlements. Secondly; the presence of the nearby development, which was permitted outside confines, must be acknowledged. That development, however, was approved at a different time when the Council responsibly acknowledged that it did not have five-years of housing supply and thereby permitted certain development that otherwise may not have been permitted. The lack of an appropriate level of housing land supply would have been a significant tilting factor that overcame the visual harm that development causes. Lastly whether or not the site is a logical

extension to the village is largely academic as the site by virtue of its nature and location is contrary to the Development Plan and thereby must fail. Although in any event the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area but on this occasion there is no automatic overriding considerations that would overcome this harm. Thereby the submission does not make a persuasive argument in favour of the proposal that would justify setting aside the Development Plan conflict identified.

As such the development is contrary to the identified Local Plan and JCS policies above and is inconsistent with the NPPF which seek sustainable patterns of growth and to protect the intrinsic character of the open countryside.

## 2. Impact on the character and appearance of the area

The site contributes toward the open green aspect to this side of the village, comprising an area of grassland with enclosing hedgerow characteristic of a Paddock making a significant contribution to the rural setting of the village and the Conservation Area and functions as a buffer between the built edge of the village and farmed land beyond.

The proposal would fundamentally alter the sites green and spacious character and urbanise the rural setting of the village to the north. As such the proposal would have absolute harm to the visual amenities of the site as well as to its surroundings and the way in which the area is experienced. This harm as well as being felt by the environment would be particularly apparent to surrounding occupiers, users of the Public Rights of Way (PROW) GG1 and GD15 to the east and users of the A43 to the north. This harm is also cumulative when taken together with the nearby Redrow development. The reasons for the approval of that neighbouring scheme are discussed above.

Whilst the indicative plan provided would result in a relatively low dense development this would not significantly reduce the harm caused by the residential intrusion which would be conspicuous and enduring. The provision and retention of boundary landscaping would also not effectively mitigate the urbanisation of the site and the harm it would have to the areas rural character and contribution it makes to the Village's rural character.

In addition given that the site closely relates to the village Conservation Area (to the south) it also falls to be considered under Section 72 of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which sets out the duty of Local Planning Authorities to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area including its setting.

The Conservation Area runs along the rear garden boundaries of dwellings fronting Kettering Road to the south and is separated from the site by the rural lane; The Banks which links up with a pedestrian throughway which joins up with Crane Close and PROW GD15 to the west. The extent of the Conservation Area here enables the linear core of the village to have a relationship with the surrounding countryside in terms of its physical and visual association whilst also retaining a softly landscaped edge.

The proposal would fundamentally change this interrelationship and views of the countryside experienced from within the Conservation Area will be lost particularly as experienced from The Banks and also conversely would severe views of the Conservation Area experienced from the north, including views from the application site. The development would also result in the soft vegetative edge to the Conservation Area as seen from southern viewpoints being replaced by the new housing with all the domestic (non-rural) paraphernalia that entails. Such a change cannot be considered to be a positive change and as such the proposal has less than significant harm to the character and appearance of a designated heritage including views from that asset.

As a result the proposal has failed to result in a development that respects the character and appearance of the site, the surrounding area and the rural setting of the Village and also fails to respect the rural setting of the Conservation Area and views from it. As such the proposal is inconsistent with JCS Policies 2 and 8 (d) and NPPF Chapters 7 and 12 that seek development to respect local character and context and preserve the significance of heritage assets. This is harm that should be afforded weight in the planning balance.

### 3. Impact on residential amenities

Given the size of the site, the low density proposed and that the proposal seeks outline approval it is likely that an appropriately designed scheme that provides a good standard of residential amenity for future users of the site and surrounding neighbours can be proposed in the reserved matters. The comings and goings associated with the twenty proposed dwellings along Grange Road would not likely give rise to concerns to the amenities of surrounding residents and thereby is not a determinative factor.

Any impact to health (or the environment) arising from possible ground contamination can be controlled via condition requiring a phased environmental risk assessment to be carried out prior to commencement of the development.

In addition, the proposal was accompanied by a 'Noise Impact Assessment' which said that the primary source of noise in the area was the A43 and concluding that *an appropriate acoustic environment can be provided to the proposed residential properties*. The Council's Environmental Protection Officer (EPO) has considered the Assessment, however, and say that that the internal noise levels will not meet the requirements of BS8233:2014 and that the garden noise levels of those properties closest to the A43 will not achieve the requirements of this standard. The EPO goes on to say that the internal noise levels can be mitigated to some extent by enhanced glazing, however windows will have to be closed to achieve the required noise levels. Such a scenario would have an impact on the quality of life experienced by future residents of the site, particularly those to its northern edge close to the A43.

As such there is no reason to believe that the proposal, in the context of an outline submission, would harm neighbours amenity. The application, however, has failed to demonstrate that future occupiers would not suffer from adverse noise exposure in a way that also protects their quality of life. Therefore the proposal is unacceptable in this regard, inconsistent with Policy 8 (e) of the JCS that seeks to ensure the



amenities of future occupiers.

#### 4. Impact on the safety and convenience of the highway

Policy 8 (b) of the JCS seeks to ensure that development has a satisfactory means of access and resist development that prejudices highway safety.

Many of the matters raised by the Local Highway Authority (LHA) including the design of the internal road, parking provision and driveway arrangement will be considered at the reserved matter stage. Whilst access is also a reserved matter and thereby the exact arrangement of the access is not a consideration at this stage, the access would be onto Grange Road and thereby the acceptability of this as an access route should be considered. The 'Transport Statement' that accompanied the application did not tackle the ability of Grange Road to cope with the additional movements in any meaningful way. It is for this key reason, consistent with the LHA response, that the proposal has failed to demonstrate that the proposal could be delivered in a way that respects highway safety.

The LHA request for contributions to mitigate the proposals highway implications could be secured in a Section 106 agreement. There is, however, no such signed agreement in place and the draft Heads of Terms submitted does not, in any event, indicate a willingness to make a highway related contribution. As such this would also contribute toward the failure of the proposal to be highway safe. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy 8 (b) of the JCS and inconsistent with paragraph 32 of the NPPF which requires decisions to take account of whether proposals have *safe and suitable access*. Thereby this is further harm that is afforded weight in the planning balance.

#### 5. Impact on flooding and sewerage provision

Policy 5 of the JCS, amongst other things, seeks development to reduce flood risk and contribute toward flood risk management. This approach is consistent with Chapter 10 of the NPPF, which says that proposals should not result in an increased chance of flooding on site or elsewhere.

As the site is under 1ha, located in flood zone 1 (least likely to flood) and as there is no watercourse within or in close proximity to the site the application does not meet the criteria that would trigger the requirement for a flood risk assessment to be undertaken and therefore the relevant flood authority is not a consultee. As such and with no reason to believe otherwise subject to the proposal be carried out in accordance with recognised modern drainage practices (including the provision of soakaways), which can be ensured via condition the proposal would not have an adverse impact to flooding on site or elsewhere.

In addition the ability of the existing foul water arrangements to cope with the development is a third party concern. There is also no reason to believe that the local sewerage network does not have capacity or that there is a wastewater problem in the area. As such and in the absence of evidence that would support a different view, the proposal is acceptable in this respect.

#### 6. Impact on ecology

Paragraph 99 of Circular 06/05 states that: *it is essential that the presence or*

*otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, is established before the planning permission is granted, otherwise all relevant material considerations may not have been addressed in making the decision.* Likewise section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (NERC 2006) states that: *every public authority must in exercising its functions, have regard ... to the purpose of conserving (including restoring / enhancing) biodiversity.*

Policy 4 of the JCS, consistent with Chapter 11 of the NPPF seeks to protect biodiversity and promote ecological enhancement.

In order to demonstrate compliance with these policies and protecting legislation the application was accompanied by a 'Preliminary Ecological Appraisal' which included the results of a Phase I habitat survey and a Bat scoping survey. The Appraisal said that the site generally has low ecological value although the hedgerows and trees bordering the site are considered to have moderate conservation value. There is no reason to disagree with this overall assessment of the site. The Appraisal goes on to conclude that the development of the site would not harm roosting bats (if they exist) or foraging and commuting bats subject to the imposition of safeguarding conditions. The Appraisal also says that the impact of the proposal to birds can be mitigated by preventing tree/hedge removal during the bird nesting season and that the proposal is unlikely to cause impact to Great Crested Newts, Reptiles, Badger and Invertebrates. The appraisal also makes a series of recommendation for enhancement.

The County ecologist has assessed the Appraisal and broadly agrees with its methodology and its findings. As such subject to the proposal being carried out in accordance with this Appraisal, which can be secured by condition, the development is considered to protect wildlife species, whether they are protected or not. Therefore the proposal is acceptable in this regard.

#### 7. Impact on trees and hedgerow

As noted above the biodiversity value of the existing site is principally derived from its boundary hedging and trees and thereby from an ecological perspective and also from a visual amenity point of view this boundary planting should be retained.

The indicative layout submitted with the application appears to show that the proposal can be delivered in a way that protects the sites boundary planting. In some cases, however the indicative plan shows the built form of the development very close to its edges. Such close proximity to the site boundaries may severely compromise the well-being of the sites boundary hedging and trees and also trees outside the site on neighbouring land. The proposal has not been accompanied by an arboricultural report indicating that the indicative plan can be delivered in a way that protects the well-being of that important boundary planting. This failure to demonstrate is a failing of the application that counts against it as it conflicts with JCS Policy 4 (b)(iii) which seeks to *preserve...natural and semi-natural habitat within and adjacent to development schemes.*

#### 8. Impact on archaeology

As the site has been subject to archaeological survey work in the past and has been

assessed as being quarried the proposal would not likely reveal any archaeological assets of value. As such and consistent with the findings of the County Archaeologist the proposal is considered to be acceptable in this respect.

#### 9. Community infrastructure and affordable housing provision

The submitted 'Planning, Design and Access Statement' and the indicative layout have indicated an intention to provide 30% affordable housing. The JCS in its Policy 30 (d) however, as noted by the Council's Housing Officer, requires the provision of 40% (8) affordable units. As such the amount of affordable housing proposed is in conflict with Development Plan policy with no justification given within the application for such under provision.

The application also shows a willingness to provide financial contributions, by providing a Draft Heads of Terms for a Section 106 Agreement towards primary and secondary education, fire and rescue, open space, libraries and monitoring. There is no mention within this document with respect to affordable housing provision or early year's education and highway related contributions.

In any event, however, there is no signed Section 106 Agreement to secure these benefits. In the absence of this there is no assurance that the necessary infrastructure would be secured. As such the application is contrary to Policy 10 of the JCS that seeks the provision of mitigating infrastructure and Policy 30, which amongst other things, seeks to provide affordable housing in the interest of providing a housing mix and tenure.

#### 10. Benefits

Given that the Council currently has no shortfall in housing supply (or delivery) there is not considered to be any substantial weight that should be given in favour of a proposal that contradicts the Development Plan.

The scheme would offer a number of social and economic benefits. These include the provision of direct and indirect jobs and increased local spend by future occupiers. Some net ecological enhancement may also be applied although in the absence of an arboricultural report demonstrating that the sites boundary trees and hedging can be retained any demonstrated environmental enhancement would be limited. As such the benefits attributed to the proposal whilst significant in terms of socio-economic benefits the weight afforded would not be more than some.

#### 11. Planning Balance

The benefits that would accrue from the development are set out above and whilst some weight can be afforded to the economic and social dimensions of the NPPF, this weight is not considered to be over-riding in any balance especially where there would be substantial environmental harm, in allowing unjustified development in the open countryside.

The proposal has also failed to demonstrate that the development would not have a detrimental impact to highway safety, future resident's amenities as a result of noise exposure from the A43 and to the well-being of boundary hedgerow and trees. The development would also harm the character and appearance of the site, the surrounding area and the rural setting of the village and have an adverse impact to

the setting of a Conservation Area and rural views from it. All of this weight when mounted together is substantial.

Importantly the Council can demonstrate over five years (5.7) plus a 5% buffer of housing land supply, including in the rural area when considered in isolation. As such there is no requirement to bring forward speculative developments, such as this, in unsustainable locations in a way that is not plan led and thereby contrary to the strategic aims of the Development Plan, to meet a housing need. Thereby there would also be conflict with the economic and social dimension of sustainability, which seeks to ensure, amongst other things, the delivery of land in the right place. This particular matter must be given tilting weight in any balance.

Paragraph 8 of the NPPF makes it clear that the dimensions to sustainable development are mutually dependent. As such and having regard to policies in the NPPF, the significant short-comings of the scheme in all three dimensions (economic, social and environmental) despite some benefits, result in the firm view that the proposal cannot be considered sustainable development, especially in light of the Council's current housing land supply position.

### **Conclusion**

The application is recommended for refusal on the grounds that the proposed development would not accord with Development Plan Policy. These Policy documents seek to concentrate future development to the Boroughs Growth and Market Towns, whilst strictly controlling development in the rural areas in order to provide sustainable pattern of growth and to protect the intrinsic character of the countryside.

It is not considered that there are material planning considerations that would outweigh this conflict as the Council has over five years' worth of housing land. In addition, the adverse impacts of approving the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits by reason of harm to the rural character of the area together with the other areas of harm or failures to demonstrate identified. The application is therefore also contrary to the NPPF and fails to demonstrate any valid exceptions to the presumption against residential development in this location, either by providing essential support for local services under threat or providing exception site housing to meet a locally identified need. The proposal is not supported locally or brought forward as a result of a neighbourhood plan through the government's Localism Agenda. As a result the application is refused.

### **Background Papers**

Title of Document:

Date:

Contact Officer:

Sean Bennett, Senior Development Officer on 01536 534316

### **Previous Reports/Minutes**

Ref:

Date:

## DO I NEED A MONITORING PRO-FORMA?

Form to be completed within "Communications" where any of the following questions are answered "YES":

Loss/gain of planning unit	YES
Loss/gain floorspace (non-residential)	NO
Change of use for retail, leisure or employment	NO
Renewable energy projects	