

ITEM:		RECOMMENDATION: REFUSAL
REF NO:	3PL/2017/1124/O	CASE OFFICER Lisa ODonovan
LOCATION:	ROUDHAM/LARLING Adjacent Woodlands Watton Road, Larling, Roudham	APPNTYPE: Outline POLICY: Out Settlemnt Bndry ALLOCATION: N CONS AREA: N LB GRADE: N TPO: N
APPLICANT:	Mr Simon Armes Woodlands Watton Road	
AGENT:	Mr Stuart Clancy M M C Norfolk Ltd 53 The Oaks	
PROPOSAL:	Two detached bungalows with access to the Watton Road	

REASON FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

The application is brought to committee at the request of the Ward Representative

KEY ISSUES

Principle of development
Impact on character and appearance
Amenity impact
Highway safety
Impact on trees
Ecology/biodiversity impact

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

The application seeks outline consent with all matters reserved for the erection of two detached bungalows on land adjoining Watton Road.

SITE AND LOCATION

The site lies to the north-east of Watton Road and forms part of the garden area of the property known as Woodlands. A small Chapel lies to the north with other residential uses on the opposite side of Watton Road to the west. The site is bounded on all sides by mature vegetation. There is an access/gateway into the site leading from the main road.

EIA REQUIRED

No

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

No relevant site history

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The following policies of the adopted Breckland Core Strategy and Development Control Policies and the adopted Site Specific Policies and Proposals Document, including the Proposals Maps, have been taken into consideration in the determination of this application. The provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Policy Guidance have also been taken into account, where appropriate

CP.04	Infrastructure
CP.10	Natural Environment
CP.14	Sustainable Rural Communities
DC.01	Protection of Amenity
DC.02	Principles of New Housing
DC.12	Trees and Landscape
DC.16	Design
DC.19	Parking Provision
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPPG	National Planning Practice Guidance
SS1	Spatial Strategy

OBLIGATIONS/CIL

Not Applicable

CONSULTATIONS

NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL HIGHWAYS

The site is located in a village with little to no services and amenities and any residents would be reliant on travelling by private car to access these on a daily basis.

It is finely balanced, in this location, as to whether visibility standards are derived from the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, which is used for highways whose main function is that of movement, or Manual for Streets which is used in cases where a sense of "place" is evident.

In this instance the site lies opposite to a number of other dwellings and through drivers on Watton Road would be expecting the possibility of slowing stopping and turning traffic associated with these. Further, the results of a traffic speed survey, commissioned by the applicant, has confirmed that the 85th percentile traffic speed is within the tolerance of that recommended in Manual for Streets.

Based on the further information supplied by the applicant it is considered that an acceptable level of visibility

can be achieved from the site access on Watton Road.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER

No objection subject to condition.

TREE AND COUNTRYSIDE CONSULTANT

No objection subject to condition.

ROUDHAM & LARLING P C

Objects on the grounds that (a) the development, although well clear of the applicant's property, is right on top of the neighbouring property (the Old Chapel); (b) The design is contrary to Policy DC 16, in that it is singularly uninspiring, and certainly could not be described as achieving the highest standards ; (c) The proposed additional access onto the B1111 is only some 14m from an existing access to the north, and 30m from one to the south, and is unnecessary, as existing access to Woodlands could be used; (d) If Breckland is minded to grant permission in spite of these objections, the application states that there might be a requirement to slightly relocate the village sign (recte notice board), and the Council asks for this to be done at the developer's expense.

ECOLOGICAL AND BIODIVERSITY CONSULTANT

No objection subject to condition.

CLLR ROBERT KYBIRD

This is an outline application which has some merit for discussion by the planning committee. This is a village infill site which has the potential to satisfy emerging policy HOU 5. I attended the Parish Council meeting which discussed this, and notwithstanding the objections raised these could be addressed by conditions attached to an outline approval. Breckland has a lack of self build plots which are encouraged by the NPPF. The applicant carries on a rural trade and has family adjacent to the plot. Government encourages house building and the plot is entirely suitable for development.

REPRESENTATIONS

Site notice erected: 13-10-2017

Consultation letters issued: 10-10-2017

Three letters of representation have been received raising concerns in respect of: Design, loss of privacy for The Chapel, unsustainability; highway safety.

ASSESSMENT NOTES

1.0 The application site is located outside of any defined Settlement Boundary as designated by the adopted Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2009). For this reason the proposal conflicts in principle with Policies DC2 and CP14 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document which seeks to focus new housing within defined Settlement Boundaries. However, paragraph 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that where an Authority does not have an up to date five year housing land supply, the relevant local policies for the supply of housing as referred to above should not be considered up-to-date and that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

1.1 The Government defines sustainable development as having three broad roles:

- economic, in terms of building a strong economy and in particular by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places
- social, by supporting, strong vibrant and healthy communities by providing the supply of housing required to meet future need in a high quality environment with accessible local services and
- environmental, through the protection and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment

1.2 Paragraph 8 of the NPPF also stresses that these roles should not be undertaken in isolation because they are mutually dependent; therefore a balanced assessment against these three roles is required. In terms of the economic and social criteria, the proposal would provide two new dwellings and would therefore make a minimal contribution to the housing supply shortfall. The proposal would also provide some limited short-term economic benefits through labour and supply chain demand required during construction, and longer-term economic benefits through the additional household spend within the surrounding area that would be generated by the provision of a single dwelling. However, given the small scale nature of the development these benefits are not considered to be significant and not definitive in this instance.

1.3 The social role of sustainable development seeks to ensure, amongst other matters, the creation of a high quality built environment with accessible local services. Roudham/Larling is classified as a rural settlement through Policy SS1 (Spatial Strategy) of the adopted Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document. These villages contain limited services and facilities and the spatial strategy states that these villages are not capable of supporting consequential growth as they rely on higher order settlements for the majority of these services and facilities.

1.4 Roudham village contains no services, facilities or regular public transport options and therefore there would be a high reliance on higher order settlements for everyday needs which would likely result in higher car dependency. The nearest service centre, East Harling, is approximately 3 miles away, which is primarily accessed from unlit, unpaved roads, Attleborough, the nearest Market Town is approximately 8 miles away and is accessed via unlit, unpaved roads or via the main A11 which is unsafe for travel by any other means than by car, therefore increasing this need. The proposal is inconsistent with the social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development. This consideration weighs heavily against the proposal.

1.5 Whilst not remote from other houses on Watton Road, the proposal would nevertheless result in the development of new dwellings in the countryside that would be remote from basic services and facilities required for everyday living. The proposal would not, therefore, enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.

1.6 For these reasons highlighted above the proposal would not accord with the core planning principle in paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework which is to actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling. The proposal would also not accord with paragraph 34 of the Framework in terms of ensuring the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes will be maximised.

1.7 Environmentally, it is accepted that there are other dwellings to the west of the site however this proposal introduces two new dwellings in a current green and rural area, where the existing residential development features primarily on the other side of the road, which whilst the design is a matter for consideration at a later date, the proposal offers no improvements or benefits in terms of biodiversity, minimising waste and pollution or introduce any features to reduce emissions. There are no material benefits therefore that would outweigh the harm in this regard.

1.8 On balance and in light of the above factors, the proposal is not considered sustainable nor does it offer significant benefits in order to outweigh the harm caused by development contrary to the above mentioned policies and taking account of paragraphs 7, 8, 14, 34 and 55 of the NPPF.

2.0 Impact on character and appearance

2.1 In addition to the visual impact referred to above, the proposal indicates the siting of two dwellings at a 90 degree angle to each other with parking and turning to the front. The result is a cramped form of development leaving House Type A with a much smaller garden area than the other plot (House Type B). In addition, the majority of the garden area serving House Type B will be bounded by the gable end of House Type A, resulting in a poor layout and overall form of development, which, when viewed in the context of surrounding development is characterised by predominantly large dwellings within spacious plots, for these reasons the proposal is contrary to Policy DC16 and paragraph 17 of the NPPF.

3.0 Amenity impact

3.1 Policy DC1 seeks to protect residential amenity and that all new development must have regard to amenity considerations and states that development will not be permitted where there are unacceptable effects on the amenity of neighbouring residents and future occupants.

3.2 Whilst the scale of the proposed properties is modest, it is considered that the siting in relation to the dwelling to the north-west, known as "The Chapel", will have an overbearing impact on the occupiers of this dwelling given the small plot size and close proximity to the site. House Type B will face the south-eastern side of this property, where there is a large first floor window overlooking the application site, whilst the parking for House Type A will immediately adjoin the rear boundary of "The Chapel". In addition, the increased noise and disturbance likely to result from the development given its close proximity to "The Chapel" is considered would be harmful to the amenities of this property. As a result it is considered that the proposal would not accord with Policy DC1 or paragraph 17 of the NPPF.

4.0 Highway safety

4.1 The NPPF requires new developments to provide safe and suitable access to the site for all people. Policy CP4 seeks to ensure that all access and safety concerns are resolved in new developments. Following a speed survey being conducted as part of the application process, the Highway Authority considers that based on the further information supplied by the applicant they are satisfied that an acceptable level of visibility can be achieved from the site access on Watton Road. As a result no objections are raised on highway safety grounds subject to condition.

5.0 Impact on trees

5.1 Policy DC12 seeks to preserve the District's trees, hedgerows and other natural features and secure appropriate landscaping schemes to mitigate the impact of, and complement, new development.

5.2 The applicant has provided an Arboricultural Implications Assessment the Tree and Countryside Officer is satisfied with this subject to a condition ensuring that work on site takes place in accordance with the recommendations within the Assessment. The application is therefore considered to have due regard to Policy DC12.

6.0 Ecology impact

6.1 Policy CP10 seeks the enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity in the district. Proposals need to ensure that the ecological network and protected species are not harmed or detrimentally impacted and mitigation measures are put in place where appropriate.

6.2 The site is surrounded by a dense hedgerow and well established trees, as a result a Protected Species Appraisal was requested and submitted during the application process. The Ecology Team has advised that the proposal is acceptable subject to conditions relating to lighting during construction; precautionary methods of working; vegetation clearance and enhancements. In this respect the proposal is considered to have due regard to Policy CP10.

7.0 Conclusion

7.1 In terms of the overall planning balance of the scheme, the application is recommended for refusal. It is not considered to meet that the proposal meets all three roles of sustainable development as defined within paragraph 7 of the NPPF, which will result in any future occupants being highly reliant on car use to access day-to-day services and facilities. The proposal also fails to protect or enhance the natural or built environment. There is also concern that the proposed layout and density of development represents a cramped form of development, out of character with the primary form of development in the area.

RECOMMENDATION

Refusal of Outline Planning Permission

REASON(S) FOR REFUSAL

- 9900 Unsustainable location**
- The proposed dwellings would be remote from local services and facilities, and in the absence of convenient and safe walking and cycling routes to larger settlements, future occupants would be largely dependant on transport by car for access to work, shopping, leisure and other purposes. Consequently, it would also conflict with the principle that new development should make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling. For these reasons, the Local Planning Authority is of the view that the proposal would not represent a sustainable form of development, contrary to Policies DC2 and CP14 of the adopted Breckland Core Strategy and Development Control Policies (2009) and paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 9900 Cramped form of development**
- The proposal would result in a cramped form of overdevelopment, at odds with the primary form and character of the area, contrary to Policy DC16 of the adopted Core Strategy and Development Control Policies (2009) and paragraph 17 of the NPPF.
- 9900 Amenity impact**
- It is considered that the siting in relation to the dwelling to the north-west, known as The Chapel, will have an overbearing impact on the occupiers of this dwelling given its limited plot size and close proximity to the site. In addition, the increased noise and disturbance resulting from the development given its close proximity to The Chapel is also likely to be detrimental to the level of amenity currently enjoyed. As a result of the above, the proposal is not considered to accord with Policy DC1 of the adopted Core Strategy and Development

Control Policies (2009) or paragraph 17 of the NPPF.

2002 Application Refused Following Discussion - No Way Forward

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application in as timely a manner as possible, and by identifying matters of concern with the application and discussing those with the Applicant. However, the issues are so fundamental to the proposal that it has not been possible to negotiate a satisfactory solution and due to the harm which has been clearly identified within the reason(s) for the refusal, approval has not been possible.

Copies of all documentation submitted in connection with this application can be viewed online at <http://www.breckland.gov.uk/content/planning-search-0>

2009 Criterion E - Planning Apps Where Refused

Appeals against planning decisions

If you are aggrieved by the decision of your local planning authority to refuse permission for the proposed development or to grant it subject to conditions, then you can appeal to the Secretary of State under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

If an enforcement notice is served relating to the same or substantially the same land and development as in your application and if you want to appeal against your local planning authority's decision on your application, then you must do so within: 28 days of the date of service of the enforcement notice, or within 6 months (12 weeks in the case of a householder appeal) of the date of this notice, whichever period expires earlier.

If you want to appeal against your local planning authority's decision then you must do so within 6 months of the date of this notice.

Appeals must be made using a form which you can get from the Secretary of State at Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol, BS1 6PN or online at www.planningportal.co.uk

The Secretary of State can allow a longer period for giving notice of an appeal but will not normally be prepared to use this power unless there are special circumstances which excuse the delay in giving notice of appeal.

The Secretary of State need not consider an appeal if it seems to the Secretary of State that the local planning authority could not have granted planning permission for the proposed development or could not have granted it without the conditions they imposed, having regard to the statutory requirements, to the provisions of any development order and to any directions given under a development order.