

<b>ITEM:</b>		<b>RECOMMENDATION:</b>	REFUSAL
<b>REF NO:</b>	3PL/2019/0372/F	<b>CASE OFFICER</b>	Mark Simmonds
<b>LOCATION:</b>	BEESTON Land off The Street & Herne Lane Beeston	<b>APPNTYPE:</b>	Full
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Mrs Helen Palmer-Wright Ashtree Farm Herne Lane	<b>POLICY:</b>	Part In Set Bndry
<b>AGENT:</b>	Stone Planning Consultants 4, Redisham Close, Lowestoft	<b>ALLOCATION:</b>	N
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Erection of six dwellings comprising of 4 detached bungalows (2 of which will be custom builds) pair of two-storey semi detached properties, associated access and ecological enhancements.	<b>CONS AREA:</b>	N
		<b>LB GRADE:</b>	N
		<b>TPO:</b>	N

#### **REASON FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION**

Application raises significant policy issues that warrant Committee determination and is therefore considered a significant development.

#### **KEY ISSUES**

- Principle of development
- Impact on character and appearance of area and trees and hedgerow
- Impact upon amenity
- Impact upon highway safety
- Impact on Ecology
- Other matters

#### **DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT**

This application seeks permission for the erection of six dwellings with two double garages to serve the bungalows.

The development comprises of four detached, 4-bed bungalows and two 4-bed, 2-storey semi-detached properties on land to the south of The Street, Beeston. Two of the bungalows are proposed to be self/custom build. A new access is proposed off The Street.

#### **SITE AND LOCATION**

The application site is located outside, but adjacent to, the Settlement Boundary for Beeston. The site currently forms part of a larger agricultural field with the boundaries to the north and west consisting of a mature hedgerow. The site is bounded to the north by The Street and beyond residential dwellings, to the west by Herne Lane, to the south by the existing larger field within the applicants ownership and beyond Ash

Tree Farm, and to the north-east by residential dwellings.

**EIA REQUIRED**

No

**RELEVANT SITE HISTORY**

3PL/2018/0472/F- 6 dwellings to include two affordable properties. Refused permission 20/12/2018.

3PL/2015/1355/F - 6 dwellings. Refused permission 26/01/2017.

Appeal of 1355/F (3171002) was dismissed 31/08/2017.

**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.01	Housing
CP.04	Infrastructure
CP.09	Pollution and Waste
CP.10	Natural Environment
CP.11	Protection and Enhancement of the Landscape
CP.13	Accessibility
CP.14	Sustainable Rural Communities
DC.01	Protection of Amenity
DC.02	Principles of New Housing
DC.12	Trees and Landscape
DC.13	Flood Risk
DC.16	Design
DC.17	Historic Environment
DC.19	Parking Provision
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPPG	National Planning Practice Guidance

**OBLIGATIONS/CIL**

Not applicable

**CONSULTATIONS**

### **BEESTON WITH BITTERING PARISH COUNCIL**

The parish council has no objections to the application and notes that the application is adjacent to the settlement boundary, will contribute to the district 5 year housing land supply, better addresses the issues of wildlife than the previous application, provides self build units and will provide potential additional support for the soon to be reopened public house.

### **CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER**

Based on the information provided to me at this time, there are no objections or further comments on the grounds of Environmental Protection, providing the development proceeds in line with the application details and subject to conditions to alleviate environmental concerns.

### **ECOLOGICAL AND BIODIVERSITY CONSULTANT**

An Ecological Surveys Protected Species and Habitat Surveys report (Anglian Ecology; 2015), eDNA survey for great crested newts report (Arbtech; April 2016 and great crested newt population surveys report (Arbtech; June 2016) has been submitted in support of this application. Due to the time that has elapsed since previous survey visits were undertaken, the survey data in the ecology reports is no longer considered valid and updated surveys will be required. The plans provided in Appendix 3 of the great crested newt mitigation plan (Arbtech; November 2016) does not appear to match up with the location and block plan (Graham Nourse; March 2019). From publicly available aerial sources there appears to be a pond located less than 80 metres north west of the site and this does not appear to have been assessed for potential to support great crested newts. This pond appears to be pond 18 in the Ecological Surveys report (Anglian Ecology; October 2015).

The proposed development could be considered a barrier to great crested newt movement between ponds to the east and to the north west of the site. The area of habitat to be lost is greater than the area of compensatory habitat and therefore there will be a net loss of habitat. The proposed fence around the pond is unlikely to prevent great crested newts from being killed/ injured post development.

### **TREE AND COUNTRYSIDE CONSULTANT**

We will need to know exactly how much of the hedgerow will require removal in order to achieve access and visibility. Currently information provided regarding this is a little vague. As noted in previous application the hedgerow has been identified as being important under the 1997 regulations, therefore removal of more than an access point - i.e 5m - 10m is likely to be unacceptable.

### **HOUSING ENABLING OFFICER**

I would like to make the applicant aware that this authority holds a register of custom and self build applicants. We offer a free service whereby details of plots for sale can be sent to those on the register. If the applicant would like to take advantage of this free service, they should contact the Enabling Officer with details of selling prices etc. shortly before the plots come to market.

### **NORFOLK FIRE & RESCUE SERVICE**

Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service would like to add the following as a planning condition to this development: With reference to this application, taking into account the location of the existing fire hydrant coverage, Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service will require a hydrant to be installed on no less than a 90mm main. No development shall commence on site until a scheme has been submitted for the provision of the fire hydrant on the development in a location agreed with the Council in consultation with Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service Informative With reference to the condition, the developer will be expected to meet the costs of supplying and installing the fire hydrant. This is to ensure adequate water infrastructure provision is made on site for the local fire service to tackle any property fire.

**NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL HIGHWAYS**

No Comments Received

**REPRESENTATIONS**

A site notice was erected on 30th April 2019 and twenty neighbours were consulted.

14 neighbours have objected the proposals. Their comments have been summarised below;

- Many concerns regarding the loss of hedgerow.
- Absence of Consultation on Proposal.
- Despite a number of rejected applications for planning approval on this site, no attempt to engage with local residents to discuss the impacts has been evident and consultation by the Parish Council has been absent prior to the PC meeting and decision to support.
- Concern regarding the Ecology and threat to Great Crested Newts.
- Building on a meadow that is outside the published village settlement boundary.
- There is no main sewer in The Street. The surface water will no doubt be disposed of via soakaways which will add to the high water table problem that we have experienced in this location. In times of high rainfall this has caused a number of septic tank drainage fields to fail with raw sewage coming to the surface. The four houses on the other side of The Street from the proposed site that are nearing completion will no doubt exacerbate this issue.
- Failure to Establish a Need. The arguments put forward in respect of creating homes for local people are speculative and unsubstantiated. No valid data has been provided to support the claimed need for additional properties on this site. The conflicting suggestions made as to who might purchase these properties contradicts the assertions made with regard to support for the Ploughshare Pub and School.
- It is noted that the application states that proposed development comprises of dwellings intended as being for the open market. Despite certain dwellings being designated as self-build (1 - plus 1 for the landowner) there can be little certainty that local people will be able to afford the expected market value. No details have been provided in respect of the calculated affordability, taking account of local employment and associated salaries.
- with 22 other planning permissions already granted in Beeston a compelling need for an additional six properties that would override all other concerns has not been established. This absence of evidence to support the notion of need is set in context when currently there is in excess of sixty properties similar to that proposed on the open market, within just 5 miles of Beeston. Some of those for sale have been marketed for extended periods, ranging back to 2018.
- This does not present a picture of an urgent need, contrary to the views put forward by members of the Parish Council.
- The proposed entrance to the narrowest part of the road does not take into account of the drainage ditch that runs between the site and the house on the street.
- The site is prone to flooding/ standing water that affects many of the houses in the area, there is no mention of any measures to deal with this.
- Concerns regarding narrow access from The Street.
- Unsustainable location/out of settlement boundary.
- Concerns regarding flooding.
- Highway safety concerns.
- The volume of heavy commercial vehicles (Juggernauts, Lorries & Heavy Farm Machinery) using the Street, has increased and the amount of near misses witnessed around the village is only going to increase with the high level of building projects already in progress in Beeston.

- The revised location for the single site entrance is now at the narrowest point of the street.
- The Street becomes a river with water running down the road towards the junction of Chapel Lane, Back Lane and Mill Drift. Water also comes from the fields to the south of The Street and it has been necessary in the past for residents in this area to use pumps to keep water away from their properties.
- The entrance to the site is at the narrowest point in The Street and due to the straight section of the road coming from the right, traffic does not unfortunately always slow down often exceeding the 30 speed restriction. Large aggregate lorries use the road together with farm traffic. Children use The Street to walk to the primary school and to catch the bus to & from the High School in Litcham. Their safety is paramount too.
- There is still a major concern about the effect on wildlife, especially the colonies of newts found on this land. This does not seem to have been addressed adequately in the proposed application. - Furthermore, the environmental investigations are dated 2015 and are now out of date. These really need to be carried out afresh, to take account of any subsequent environmental changes.
- The status of the hedgerow has now been designated as 'important, under 1997 regulations'. There is a variety of species within it, and it greatly enhances the appeal of the street and village.
- There seems to be several gaps in the applicant's plans regarding drainage. Surface water is proposed as 'via mains sewage', but there is no mains sewerage available in, or even close to, this part of the village. Foul sewage is proposed as 'unknown'. This needs to be addressed with urgency particularly in the light of flooding problems experienced by residents near this site in recent years.
- The wish that these dwellings might support the local village primary school is laudable, but four out of six of the proposed dwellings are likely to be unaffordable to young families.
- The natural soak away point opposite the public house was built on many years ago and the land on the south side of the road between the pub and the proposed site suffers with surface water issues.

Following re-consultation on additional plans the following comments were received:

- We have examined the latest Amended Location and Block Plan Rev C. These very minor changes have no material impact on the major objections that ourselves and other Beeston residents have already made in relation to this application. We therefore continue to object to this application. For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the objections we have already made are also documented in relation to this Revision, we have reproduced our previous response below.

## **ASSESSMENT NOTES**

### 1.0 Principle of development

1.1 This application seeks consent for the erection of six dwellings comprising four detached, 4-bed bungalows with two detached double garages and two 4-bed, 2-storey semi-detached properties on land to the south of The Street, Beeston. Two of the bungalows are proposed to be self/custom build. A new access is proposed off The Street. The site sits outside of any defined settlement boundary. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to Policies SS1, DC2, CP1 and CP14 of the adopted Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document, (2009), which seek to focus new housing within defined Settlement Boundaries.

1.2 Paragraph 10 of the NPPF (2019) states that at the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 11 further states that proposed development that accords with an up-to-date Local Plan should be approved without delay, and where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining applications are out-of-date, granting permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

1.3 The Council cannot demonstrate a current 5 year housing land supply and therefore the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Document which relate to housing land supply only are not considered up-to-date and therefore the material considerations are assessed in line with the sustainable development roles within paragraph 8 of the NPPF (2019):

- economic, to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure;
- social, to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering a well-designed and safe built environment, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being; and
- environmental, to contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, helping to improve biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.

1.4 Paragraph 9 of the NPPF (2019) states that these objectives should be delivered through the preparation and implementation of plans and the application of the policies in the NPPF. Planning policies and decisions should play an active role in guiding development towards sustainable solutions, but in doing so should take local circumstances into account, to reflect the character, needs and opportunities of each area.

1.6 In terms of the economic and social criteria, the proposal would provide six new dwellings and would therefore make a positive contribution to the housing supply. The proposal would provide limited short-term economic benefits through labour and supply chain demand required during construction. However, given the small scale nature of the development these benefits are not considered to be significant and not definitive in this instance.

1.7 The social role of sustainable development seeks to ensure, amongst other matters, the creation of a high quality built environment with accessible local services. Policy SS1 of the adopted Core Strategy describes seven types of place and their potential to accommodate new development. Beeston is a rural settlement for the purposes of the policy, and has only nominal allocated housing growth due to its minimal local services. The site is not located within a defined settlement boundary and is therefore in the countryside.

1.8 Beeston has minimal services and facilities available including a very limited bus service and a village hall and the services and facilities available would not meet the day-to-day needs of future occupants of the proposed dwellings. Litcham, a local service centre is approximately 3.22km (2.6miles) from the site. It is, therefore, considered that the proposal would not significantly support the services of nearby villages. Dereham (approximately 10.62km/6.6miles) and Swaffham (approximately 14.48km/9miles) are mid-sized market towns, which provide a "good range of services for their residents' day-to-day needs".

1.9 This proposal would not accord with paragraph 103 of the NPPF (2019) which is to actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling. Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. This can help to reduce congestion and emissions, and improve air quality and public health. Further to this paragraph 79 states that planning

policies and decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside.

1.10 It is also noted that a recent Appeal (ref: APP/F2605/W/18/3201174) relating to proposed residential development near Beeston was dismissed 28th January 2019. One of the issues related to the proximity of the proposed development to services. The Inspector acknowledged that the NPPF indicates that opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas. However, it also states that the planning system should actively manage patterns of growth in support of sustainable transport objectives. The Inspector concluded that the proposal failed to provide a suitable site for housing, having regard to the proximity of services.

1.11 It should be acknowledged that the Public House in Beeston has very recently re-opened and it is proposed to include a shop. However, as the Public House has only just re-opened its future success and level of service is as yet not established.

1.12 Two of the bungalows are proposed to be self build properties. The Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 require Council's to keep a register of people who wish to acquire land for self-build dwellings and that regard is had to this register when exercising planning functions. Furthermore, there is support in the Framework and the PPG for people wishing to commission or build their own homes.

1.13 Paragraph 61 of the NPPF (2019) states that the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies (including, but not limited to, those who require affordable housing, families with children, older people, students, people with disabilities, service families, travellers, people who rent their homes and people wishing to commission or build their own homes.

1.14 The Design and Access statement states that there is a high demand (over 80 people) for self build properties in the Breckland area. Under paragraph 61 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) requires Councils to plan for people wishing to build their own homes. This can be a material planning consideration for this application as self-build has been identified as the method of delivering the site. Whilst an indication of self-build has been given by the applicant it should also be noted that at this stage, as no Section 106 Legal Agreement has been put forward, it cannot be certain that the method of delivering this site will be self-build. In the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.

1.15 In light of the above considerations and that of the recent Appeal decision (dated 28 January 2019), the proposal fails to accord with Policies SS1, CP14 and DC2 of the adopted Core Strategy. It also conflicts with the sustainable development objectives of the NPPF (2019).

## 2.0 Impact on character and appearance of the area and trees and hedgerow

2.1 Policy DC16 requires all new development to achieve the highest standard of design. As part of this, all design proposals must preserve or enhance the existing character of an area. Consideration will also be given to the density of buildings in a particular area and the landscape/townscape effect of any increased density. Policy DC12 seeks to protect the District's Trees and Hedges.

2.2 Although outside the Settlement Boundary, it is noted the site adjoins the existing built up part of the village on The Street, with housing immediately to the north. There is also further built development to the west. Development of the site for housing would not, therefore, result in an isolated development. In terms of environmental considerations, it is noted the proposal would have the effect of consolidating existing

development on The Street and extending the built form into an area of open land. This would result in loss of rural character to the immediate locality.

2.3 The plots are of a generous size with sufficient amenity space and considered to be of a scale which is in keeping with the surrounding area. No materials or detail have been given on the construction of the properties.

2.4 The application site forms part of a larger field and contains a large pond which would be adjacent to plots 4 and 5. The application proposes six dwellings to be located as frontage development along The Street and Herne Lane, with one access to serve them all from The Street. Part of the hedging would need to be removed to allow for the access and required visibility splays.

2.5 The hedgerow that borders the site to the west has been identified as being important hedgerow under the 1997 regulations. For a hedgerow to qualify as being "important" and therefore protected under the Hedgerows Regulations 1997, it has to have been in existence for at least 30 years.

2.6 The Tree and Countryside Consultant has been consulted and commented they would need to know exactly how much of the hedgerow will require removal in order to achieve access and visibility. Currently information provided regarding this is a little vague. As noted in previous application the hedgerow has been identified as being important under the 1997 regulations, therefore removal of more than an access point - i.e 5m to 10m is likely to be unacceptable.

2.7 An amended plan was submitted detailing the area to be removed which is to the north of the site to create the access to the site, however, this plan fails to provide the extent of hedge to be removed to create the access and the required visibility splays. As a result, the proposal is contrary to Policies DC12 and CP11 of the adopted Breckland Council Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2009) and the NPPF (2019) (in particular Paragraph 170).

### 3.0 Impact upon amenity

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

3.2 In terms of neighbour amenity, given the scale of the proposal, proposed separation distances, and existing/proposed boundary treatments the proposal would not impact significantly upon neighbour or future occupants amenity in terms of loss of light, privacy or overlooking. Therefore, the proposal is considered to comply with Policy DC1 of the adopted Core Strategy and paragraph 127 of the NPPF (2019).

### 4.0 Impact upon 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.

4.2 The Highway Authority have commented that the revised access location is acceptable and will also improve visibility for the property immediately to the east. However, as advised 17 May, the previous submission included a proposal to surface the area of overrun outside the village hall to cater for the increase in vehicular traffic using this part of the highway network. They cannot see that this forms part of the current revision and have requested a revised drawing in this respect. The land in question does not form part of the

highway and they understand it is owed by Beeston Playing Field Committee.

4.3 Until a drawing showing the off-site works previously proposed has been submitted, the Highway Authority is unable to provide a full response.

## 5.0 Impact on Ecology

5.1 Policy CP10 seeks to protect the natural environment including protected species and Policy CP11 seeks the protection and enhancement of the landscape for the sake of its intrinsic beauty and benefit to the rural character. Development should have particular regard to maintaining the aesthetic and biodiversity qualities of natural and man-made features within the landscape, including consideration of individual or groups of natural and man-made features such as trees, hedges and woodland or rivers, streams or other topographical features.

5.2 Paragraph 174 of the NPPF (2019) states that to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should:

- a) Identify, map and safeguard components of local wildlife-rich habitats and wider ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity; wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them; and areas identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation; and
- b) promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity.

5.3 Paragraph 175 of the NPPF (2019) says when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principle:

- a) if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused.

5.4 The Ecologist commented that an Ecological Surveys Protected Species and Habitat Surveys report (Anglian Ecology; 2015), eDNA survey for great crested newts report (Arbtech; April 2016) and great crested newt population surveys report (Arbtech; June 2016) has been submitted in support of this application. Due to the time that has elapsed since previous survey visits were undertaken, the survey data in the ecology reports is no longer considered valid and updated surveys will be required. The plans provided in Appendix 3 of the great crested newt mitigation plan (Arbtech; November 2016) does not appear to match up with the location and block plan (Graham Nourse; March 2019). From publicly available aerial sources there appears to be a pond located less than 80 metres north west of the site and this does not appear to have been assessed for potential to support great crested newts. This pond appears to be pond 18 in the Ecological Surveys report (Anglian Ecology; October 2015).

5.5 The proposed development could be considered a barrier to great crested newt movement between ponds to the east and to the north west of the site. The area of habitat to be lost is greater than the area of compensatory habitat and therefore there will be a net loss of habitat. The proposed fence around the pond is unlikely to prevent great crested newts from being killed/ injured post development.

5.6 The applicant has requested that the application be put forward to planning committee subject to

satisfactory amended reports being submitted at a later date due to the cost implications and other outstanding issues with the application.

5.7 Due to the above, the application fails to comply with Policy CP10 and paragraph 174 of the NPPF (2019).

6.0 Other matters

6.1 Contaminated Land

6.2 The Contaminated Land officer has been consulted and comments that based on the information provided at this time; there are no objections or further comments on the grounds of Environmental Protection, providing the development proceeds in line with the application details and subject to conditions to alleviate environmental concerns.

6.3 Flood Risk

6.4 Policy DC13 requires new development to be located in areas of low risk to flooding.

6.5 The Environment Agency Flood maps identifies the site to be in a Flood Zone 1, the preferable area for development.

6.6 There have been concerns from residents regarding surface water flooding and drainage, this would need to be addressed by way of conditions should the application be approved.

7.0 Conclusion

7.1 Taking in to consideration all the above, the proposal is considered to represent an unsustainable form of development. The Planning Inspectorate confirmed that Beeston is not a sustainable area in the recent appeal decided in January 2019. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to Policies SS1, DC2, CP1 and CP14 of the adopted Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document, (2009).

7.2 The boundary hedgerow, is an Important Hedgerow, as defined under Schedule 1, Paragraph 7 of the Hedgerow Regulations 1997 (as amended). The proposed development would involve the loss of the Important Hedgerow and the applicant has failed to provide evidence or plans to show how the hedge will be retained, this would be detrimental to the rural character and appearance of the area. As a result, the the proposal is contrary to Policies DC12 and CP11 of the adopted Breckland Council Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2009) and the NPPF (2019).

7.3 Due to the time that has elapsed since the previous GCN survey visits were undertaken, the survey data in the ecology reports is no longer considered valid and updated surveys will be required. The applicant has failed to provide the updated Surveys. The proposed development could be considered a barrier to great crested newt movement between ponds to the east and to the north west of the site. The area of habitat to be lost is greater than the area of compensatory habitat and therefore there will be a net loss of habitat. The proposed fence around the pond is unlikely to prevent great crested nets from being killed/ injured post development. Therefore, the application fails to comply with Policy CP10 and paragraph 174 of the NPPF (2019).

7.4 The application is therefore, recommended for refusal.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Recommendation: That Planning Permission be REFUSED for the following reasons.

**REASON(S) FOR REFUSAL**

- 1 Policy not met outside settlement**

The proposed dwelling 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 dependent on transport by car for access to work, shopping, leisure and other purposes. 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 paragraphs 8 and 11 of the NPPF (2019).
- 2 Ecology**

Due to the time that has elapsed since the previous GCN survey visits were undertaken, the survey data in the ecology reports is no longer considered valid and updated surveys will be required. The applicant has failed to provide the updated Surveys. The proposed development could be considered a barrier to great crested newt movement between ponds to the east and to the north west of the site. The area of habitat to be lost is greater than the area of compensatory habitat and therefore there will be a net loss of habitat. The proposed fence around the pond is unlikely to prevent great crested newts from being killed/ injured post development. Therefore, the application fails to comply with Policy CP10 and paragraph 174 of the NPPF (2019).
- 3 Important Hedgerow**

The boundary hedgerow, is an Important Hedgerow, as defined under Schedule 1, Paragraph 7 of the Hedgerow Regulations 1997 (as amended). The proposed development would involve the loss of the Important Hedgerow and the applicant has failed to provide evidence or plans to show how the hedge will be retained. This would be detrimental to the rural character and appearance of the area, As a result, the the proposal is contrary to Policies DC12 and CP11 of the adopted Breckland Council Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2009) and the NPPF (2019).