

ITEM:		RECOMMENDATION:	APPROVAL
REF NO:	3PL/2020/1215/PIP	CASE OFFICER	Tom Donnelly
LOCATION:	THOMPSON Land to east of Marlpit Road and South of Mill Road Thompson	APPNTYPE:	Permission Principle
APPLICANT:	Blue Oak Developments Limited c/o Agent	POLICY:	Out Settlemnt Bndry
AGENT:	Armstrong Rigg Planning The Exchange Colworth Science Park	CONS AREA:	N
PROPOSAL:	Permission in Principal for the erection of up to 4 dwellings (Town and Country Planning (Permission in Principle) (Amendment) Order 2017)	LB GRADE:	N
		TPO:	N

REASON FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

The application was referred to Planning Committee from Chairmans Panel on the basis that it is a significant application.

KEY ISSUES

Principle of development

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

The application seeks permission in principle for the erection of up to 4 dwellings on site.

SITE AND LOCATION

The application site is land east of Marlpit Road and south of Mill Road. The site is outside but immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary of Thompson

EIA REQUIRED

No

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

3PL/2019/0155/F

Withdrawn

08-04-19

Erection of 8no. dwellings comprising 1no. bungalow, 2no. affordable units and 5no. houses with associated

access, parking and landscaping

3PL/2019/1189/F	Refusal	13-03-20
-----------------	---------	----------

Erection of 6 Dwellings

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The following policies of the Breckland Local Plan, 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

COM01	Design
COM03	Protection of Amenity
ENV02	Biodiversity protection and enhancement
ENV05	Protection and Enhancement of the Landscape
HOU04	Villages with Boundaries
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPPG	National Planning Practice Guidance
TR02	Transport Requirements

OBLIGATIONS/CIL

Not Applicable

CONSULTATIONS

THOMPSON P C

Thompson Parish Council wishes to OBJECT to the following planning application: 3PL/2020/1215/PIP Permission in Principal for the erection of up to 4 dwellings Definition. Land Use. The proposal would have a harmful intrusion into the open countryside, partially filling a green space, which contributes to the character of this area to the detriment of the character and visual amenities of the area. Consequently, the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policies COM 01, GEN 02 and HOU 04 of the Breckland Local Plan 2019 (LP) and paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Location The site is situated outside of, but immediately adjacent to, the settlement boundary of Thompson. In planning policy terms, it is therefore within the countryside. The proposal is completely out of keeping in terms of scale and density resulting in an incongruous and unwarranted intrusion. The proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be contrary to Policies HOU6, GEN02 and COM01 of the Local Plan which require amongst other things that the design and layout will optimise the density of the development to a level which is appropriate and justified for the locality. The Planning Inspector's comments in a recent separate but localised appeal within Thompson village stated (Appeal Ref: APP/F2605/W/20/3251745 dated 21 September 2020). The proposal falls within the zone of influence of a European designated site, the Breckland Special Protection Area (SPA). New residential development could potentially have a significant effect on the sensitive interest features of this European designated site, through increased recreational pressure. Amount of development The local plan allows a 5% increase of properties through until 2036 - a total of 7 (as

adjudicated by the Planning Inspector in his dismissal of the recent Appeal to develop the site (Appeal Ref: APP/F2605/W/20/3252830 dated 21 October 2020)). Approval has already been given for 4 properties to be developed along Marlpit Road, a further 4 from this proposal means the plan is exceeded, albeit by one. The Planning Inspector went on to say (and irrespective of number of dwellings the sentiment remains valid): I have already found that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, the proposed development would be contrary to Policy HOU 04 by virtue of its conflict with criterion 1, which requires development proposals to be of an appropriate scale and design to the settlement. The proposal would also conflict with LP Policies GEN 01 and GEN 05 which require, amongst other matters, that development proposals protect and enhance the natural and built environment. I have found the proposal would give rise to unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area contrary to a number of LP policies. As a result, the proposal would not accord with the environmental objective of the Framework. This is a matter I give significant weight. The proposal would result in the number of dwellings in the settlement increasing rapidly contrary to the requirements of policy HOU 04 (2) of the Breckland Local Plan (adopted), which seeks to promote sustainable development. Therefore, the principle of development is not accepted and conflicts with Policy GEN 01, GEN 03, GEN 05, HOU 02 and HOU 04 of the Breckland Local Plan (adopted). The proposal intends to shoe horn 4 dwellings into an area half the size of that dismissed in the recent appeal that itself had proposed a total of 6 dwellings. One wonders what the other half of the site will be used for?

ECOLOGICAL AND BIODIVERSITY CONSULTANT

Updated ecology reports will need to be submitted as part of the detailed application

NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL HIGHWAYS

The scope of the development has been reduced to 4 and therefore, if you are minded to grant approval, the Technical Details submission will need to include the following:-

- Accesses located to achieve linear and forward visibility of 43m. Linear visibility being from a 2.4m set back
- Parking in accordance with adopted guidance
- On site turning arrangements
- Any access gates set back 5m from the carriageway edge

TREE AND COUNTRYSIDE CONSULTANT

No objection in principle. Dependent on the detailed layout and relationship to trees.

HISTORIC BUILDINGS CONSULTANT

No objection in principle.

REPRESENTATIONS

The neighbour consultation period expired on 03-12-20.

Additionally, a site notice and press notice was posted which expired on 18-12-20 and 21-12-20 respectively.

18 letters of representation were received with the key points raised as follows:

- Unsustainable location
- Outside settlement boundary
- Harm the character of the village
- Unacceptable risk to traffic
- Surface water flooding risk

- Thompson is an unsustainable location

ASSESSMENT NOTES

1.0 Principle of development

1.1 The application seeks permission in principle for the erection of up to 4 dwellings on site. The application site is within the parish of Thompson which is identified as a village with a boundary in the Breckland Local Plan (Adopted 2019). Therefore, Policy HOU04 applies to the principle of development.

1.2 Applications for Permission in Principle (PIP) must only consider the location of development, the proposed land use and the amount of development.

1.3 Policy HOU04 allows for development outside of the settlement boundary of such villages subject to certain criteria being satisfied. The criteria are as follows:

- The development is of an appropriate scale and design to the settlement.
- It would not lead to the number of dwellings in the settlement increasing by significantly more than 5% from the date of adoption.
- The design contributes to preserving, and where possible enhancing, the historic nature and connectivity of communities
- The development avoids the coalescence of settlements.

1.4 In terms of the first criteria, the proposed development is of a modest scale (up to 4 dwellings) and it is therefore considered that this represents an appropriate scale of development for the settlement. It is not possible to consider the design of the development at this stage as the application solely considers the principle of development. However, it is considered that an appropriate design of development can be provided at the detailed application stage.

1.5 In terms of the second criteria, 5% growth in Thompson would equate to 7 new dwellings. Housing figures indicate that there have been 6 new dwellings approved which are counted toward to 5% growth. Approval of this application would result in 10 dwellings approved. It is not considered that this would result in an increase significantly over the 5% growth stated in HOU04. However, submission detail from the agent references an appeal inspectors report which states that a permission that counts 4 towards the 5% target should only count as 1 towards the 5% as there was already an extant permission for 3 dwellings on site. If this reasoning is applied to the parish, there are only 3 new dwellings currently given permission. As a result, approval of this application would take the number of new dwellings to 7 in Thompson matching the 5% growth outlined in Policy HOU04. It is therefore considered that if either reasoning is applied to the development, this criteria of Policy HOU04 would be complied with in principle.

1.6 In terms of the third criteria, again, it is not possible to fully assess the proposal against this criteria as there are no specific details of the dwellings proposed. However, it is considered that an appropriate response to the historic nature and connectivity of the community can be provided at detailed stage.

1.7 Finally, the development avoids the coalescence of settlements due to its location well within the parish boundary of Thompson.

1.8 Finally, the application site is situated immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary of Thompson and therefore complies with this requirement of Policy HOU04.

1.9 Overall, it is considered that the principle of development satisfies the requirements of Policy HOU04 and therefore it is considered that the application can be recommended for approval.

2.0 Other matters

2.1 It is noted that concerns have been raised regarding highway safety, surface water drainage, and ecology among other matters. It is considered that these details can be investigated more fully at technical details stage and assessed against the appropriate policies.

2.2 In terms of the amount of development, it is considered that the size of the site is capable of accommodating up to 4 dwellings as specified in the submission detail without appearing cramped. However, as previously stated, this will be explored further and in greater detail at technical details stage.

3.0 Conclusion

3.1 This application solely considers the principle of development. It is considered that the proposal satisfies the requirements of Policy HOU04 in principle and accordingly this application is recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION

This application is recommended for approval.

CONDITIONS
