

<b>ITEM:</b>		<b>RECOMMENDATION:</b>	REFUSAL
<b>REF NO:</b>	3PL/2018/1057/F	<b>CASE OFFICER</b>	Naomi Minto
<b>LOCATION:</b>	NORTH TUDDENHAM Church Farm Low Road North Tuddenham	<b>APPNTYPE:</b>	Full
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Mr & Mrs J Phillips Care of Agent	<b>POLICY:</b>	Out Settlemnt Bndry
<b>AGENT:</b>	EJW Planning Limited Lincoln Barn Norwich Road	<b>ALLOCATION:</b>	N
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Demolition of log store and barn and replacement with single dwelling and garage		
		<b>CONS AREA:</b>	N
		<b>LB GRADE:</b>	N
		<b>TPO:</b>	N

#### REASON FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

The application is referred to Planning Committee at the request of Cllr. Bambridge.

#### KEY ISSUES

Principle of development  
Impact upon character and appearance of area  
Impact upon amenity  
Impact upon highway safety  
Other issues

#### DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

This application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of a log store and barn and erection of one detached one and a half storey four bedroom residential dwelling with a detached triple garage / carport on land to the rear of Church Farm. The proposed dwelling would not be located on the footprint of the existing log store / barn.

Access to the proposed site is via the existing access off Honeypot Lane.

#### SITE AND LOCATION

The application site is on land at Church Farm, Low Road, North Tuddenham and is located outside of any defined Settlement Boundary. The area surrounding the site is characterised by residential development to the north with fields to the south and west of the site. Oakwood Lodge (located to the north east of the site) has an extensive rear garden area, which runs the length of the eastern boundary of the proposed development site. Established hedgerows and trees run the length of the east and west boundaries of the site. The site would utilise the existing access off Low Road, which currently serves Wisteria Barn, The Stables and Church Farm.

**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.01	Housing
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.16	Design
DC.19	Parking Provision
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPPG	National Planning Practice Guidance

**OBLIGATIONS/CIL**

Not applicable

**CONSULTATIONS**

**NORTH TUDDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL**

No objection no objection subject to a condition being imposed ensuring that access to The Stables , Church Farm and Wisteria Barn remains unhindered during construction works and thereafter in perpetuity

**TREE AND COUNTRYSIDE CONSULTANT**

No objection, subject to conditions.

**ECOLOGICAL AND BIODIVERSITY CONSULTANT**

No objection, subject to conditions.

**CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER**

No objection.

**REPRESENTATIONS**

A site notice was erected on 11 September 2018 and seven neighbours consulted. No responses were received.

**ASSESSMENT NOTES**

1.0 Principle of development

1.1 This application seeks planning permission for the demolition of a log store and barn and the erection of one detached one and a half storey four bedroom dwelling with associated single storey triple garage / car port on land to the south east of Church Farm. The proposed dwelling would measure approximately 25 metres in length (at its longest point) by 17 metres in width (at its widest point). The one and a half storey section of the dwelling would measure 7.7 metres in height to the ridge line, whilst the single storey element would measure 5.1 metres in height to the ridge line.

1.2 The site is 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.

1.3 However, paragraph 11 of the NPPF (2018) states that where an authority does not have an up-to-date Development Plan or 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.

1.4 The Statement of Five Year Housing Land Supply, dated 31st March 2017 was published in July 2017. This outlined that the District does not benefit from having a five year supply of housing land (it can only demonstrate a 4.6 years housing land supply). In these cases the NPPF (2018) makes provision, in principle, for Local Planning Authorities to positively consider sites that are not within defined Settlement Boundaries. This must be balanced against other policy requirements and aims including securing sustainable development, protecting the countryside, and good design.

1.5 The NPPF (2018) constitutes guidance for local planning authorities and decision-takers and is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications to achieve sustainable development. The Government outlines three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental (paragraph 8). These dimensions give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles:

- an economic role - contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type 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;
- a social role - supporting 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

- an environmental role - contributing 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.

1.6 Paragraph 9 of the NPPF (2018) states that these roles should not be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent and that the planning system should play an active role in guiding development to sustainable solutions. A balanced assessment against these roles is, therefore, required.

1.7 In terms of the economic and social criteria, the proposal would provide one new dwelling and would therefore make a positive, albeit small, 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.

1.8 The social role of sustainable development seeks to ensure, amongst other matters, the creation of a high quality built environment with accessible local services. North Tuddenham is identified as a lower tier 'rural settlement' in the settlement hierarchy set out in the Council's Core Strategy. Such settlements are generally considered to be unsuitable for significant growth due to their small size and dependence on larger settlements for the majority of facilities. The village benefits from a farm shop, public house and restaurant (recently extended to provide a village shop), church, some employment uses, a Common and very limited public transport, which includes two bus services running between Norwich and Litcham (once per week on a Wednesday) and Dereham and Aylsham (once per week on a Friday). In this respect the proposed residential development would not represent an accessible form of development, reflective of current and future needs and would result in a high reliance upon the private car to gain access to local facilities to meet every day needs.

1.9 To promote sustainable development in rural areas, paragraph 78 of the NPPF (2018) is clear that new housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities, and isolated new homes in the countryside should be avoided unless there are special circumstances. One of the core planning principles of the NPPF is also to actively manage patterns of growth to make fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling. Consequently, new residential development should not be detached from being part of a viable and vibrant rural community, where there would be access to day to day facilities without the need to travel.

1.10 The spatial strategy within the Breckland Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2009 (CS) seeks to focus growth within established settlements where there are services and facilities, and limiting growth in rural settlements. Policy CP14 supports sustainable rural communities setting out criteria to be met for development within defined rural settlement boundaries. Policy DC2 also seeks to support new housing within development boundaries of settlements. This is considered to be broadly consistent with the core principles of the NPPF.

1.11 The site is located approximately 2 miles from Hockering, a rural settlement which contains basic services such as a public house, village hall, church, primary school and other facilities. It is also located approximately 2 miles from Mattishall, a service Centre Village with adequate services and facilities to meet the day-to-day requirements of existing residents. Access to these settlements would be via country lanes and roads that are narrow, unlit and without footpaths.

1.12 The site is located to the south east of the village in an area where there is sporadic development. The sprawling nature of development along Low Road is acknowledged and it is accepted that the addition of a further residential dwelling in this location would not be isolated in that respect. There are also no doubt that future residents of the development could make use of services within the villages of Hockering and Mattishall, thereby supporting the existing facilities. However, it is considered that the development site is physically detached from the core of these settlements.

1.13 The nearest market town with a good range of services and facilities is Dereham, which is located approximately 7 miles away. The distances involved and the conditions of these roads are such that it is not considered that occupants would readily walk or cycle between the site and these settlements. In addition, whilst it is acknowledged that there is a bus service within North Tuddenham that would link it to Norwich, Litcham, Derham and Aylsham, the services available are not daily or frequent services and the bus stops are approximately 1 mile from the application site, approximately a 15 minute walk. Occupants of the proposed dwellings would therefore be almost entirely reliant on the private car to access services and facilities. In light of the above, it is considered that the site is remote from key facilities required for day to day living. Therefore, the development would not accord with the golden thread of sustainable development as highlighted in the NPPF (paragraph 10).

1.14 In terms of the environmental objective, the proposal is not considered to be infill. In addition, the dwelling and associated garage / carport is significantly larger than the barn / log store to be demolished and the location of the proposed dwelling and the majority of the garage / carport would not be sited on the footprint of the barn / log store to be demolished. It is therefore considered that the proposal would result in a new dwelling causing further sprawl into the countryside and therefore failing to protect or enhance the natural environment. In light of the above, it is concluded that the proposed residential development would not be in a suitable location and would therefore not meet all three of the roles, which define sustainable development.

## 2.0 Impact upon the character and appearance of the area

2.1 The environmental role of sustainable development seeks to, in part, contribute to protecting and enhancing the natural, built and historic environment. Consideration of a development's impact on the character and appearance of the area within which it is situated is, therefore, integral to the environmental dimension of sustainable design, as is its design.

2.2 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.

2.3 The proposal seeks permission for the demolition of a log store and barn and the erection of one detached one and a half storey four bedroom dwelling with associated single storey triple garage / car port on land to the rear of Church Farm. Taking into account the size and siting of the dwelling, away from the existing log store / barn to be demolished, it is considered that the proposal would result in the intrusion of built development into the countryside setting, detracting from the rural character and appearance of the site and surrounding rural area, contrary to Policy DC16 of the adopted Core Strategy.

## 3.0 Impact upon amenity

3.1 Policy DC1 of the adopted Core Strategy seeks to protect residential amenity. Whilst it is acknowledged

that the proposal includes windows (serving bedrooms 2 and 4 on the first floor eastern elevation - Drg. no: 1490-2, Rev. E), the relationship of the development to neighboring dwellings and private open space and the presence of established hedging and sporadic trees along the eastern boundary is such that visual dominance, loss of light, overlooking and overshadowing impacts all fall within acceptable parameters. Furthermore, the development would ensure the proposal does not give rise to any undue noise, odour or other form of disturbance. It is concluded that the proposal will maintain an acceptable level of residential amenity for neighboring occupants, consistent with Policy DC1.

#### 4.0 Impact upon highway safety

4.1 Norfolk County Council Highways were consulted as part of the application process and advised that the site is served by a single track road with no passing provision. Highways requested the provision of a passing place between Mattishall Lane and the site, where the carriageway achieves a width of 4.8 metres, to assist in mitigating the effects of the additional car movements.

4.2 The applicant is willing to provide this and is currently in contact with the relevant body to establish the extent of the highway boundary land on Low Road. This information may not be forthcoming for ten weeks. Whilst it is acknowledged that at present Highways concerns are not sufficiently addressed, the inclusion of a condition with any forthcoming planning permission could satisfactorily ensure that Highways concerns are met. In addition, sufficient parking provision is provided on site. On that basis, the proposal accords with Policy DC19 of the adopted Core Strategy and the NPPF (2018).

#### 5.0 Other issues

5.1 As part of the consultation process the Tree and Countryside Consultant was consulted on the application and raised no objection to the proposal subject to the inclusion of a condition to ensure that operations on site would take place in complete accordance with the approved Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA), Tree Protection Plan (TPP) and Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) provided by Greenleaf dated August 2018. The proposal therefore accords with Policy DC12 of the adopted Core Strategy and the NPPF (2018).

5.2 The Ecological and Biodiversity Consultant raised no objection to the proposal subject to the inclusion of conditions in relation to mitigation measures and enhancement measures as per sections 8 and 9 of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal report (Eco-Check Consultancy Ltd; dated August 2018). The applicant is also required to provide a minimum of two nest boxes, two bat boxes and ensure any fencing needs are wildlife-friendly. The proposal therefore accords with Policy CP10 of the adopted Core Strategy and the NPPF (2018).

5.3 The Contaminated Land Officer was also consulted on the application and raised no objection to the proposal.

#### 5.0 Conclusion

2.1 Taking into account the overall planning balance of the scheme, the proposal would be contrary to policies SS1, DC2, DC16 and CP14 of the adopted Core Strategy. The site is not considered to be in a sustainable location and is inconsistent with the social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development. The above considerations weigh significantly against the proposal. Therefore, for the reasons discussed above, the application is recommended for refusal.

<b>REASON(S) FOR REFUSAL</b>
------------------------------

**2**

**Non-std reason for refusal**

The form, scale and siting of the proposed dwelling would result in the intrusion of built development into the countryside setting, detracting from the rural character and appearance of the site and surrounding rural area and leading to a building divorced from its surroundings, contrary to Policies CP11 and DC16 of the adopted Breckland Core Strategy and Development Control Policies (2009).

**3**

**Non-std reason for refusal**

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 dependant 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, 10 and 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2018).