

MINUTES of the meeting of Planning Committee held at Council Chamber, The Shire Hall, St Peter's Square, Hereford, HR1 2HX on Wednesday 7 October 2015 at 2.00 pm

Present: Councillor PGH Cutter (Chairman)
Councillor J Hardwick (Vice Chairman)

Councillors: BA Baker, CR Butler, EL Holton, TM James, JLV Kenyon, FM Norman, A Seldon, WC Skelton, J Stone, D Summers, EJ Swinglehurst and LC Tawn

In attendance: Councillors CA Gandy, MD Lloyd-Hayes and PD Newman OBE

77. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors PJ Edwards, DW Greenow, KS Guthrie, JA Hyde, and AJW Powers.

78. NAMED SUBSTITUTES

Councillor J Stone substituted for Councillor JA Hyde and Councillor D Summers for Councillor AJW Powers.

79. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Agenda item 5 – 151121 – Land off High Street, Leintwardine

Councillor WC Skelton declared a non-pecuniary interest as the applicant was a client of a former employer for whom he had previously carried out work.

Agenda item 6 – 151627 – Land Adjoining Bryants Court Cottage, Goodrich

Councillor PGH Cutter declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of the Wye Valley AONB Joint Advisory Committee.

Councillor J Hardwick declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of the Wye Valley AONB Joint Advisory Committee.

Councillor EJ Swinglehurst declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of the Wye Valley AONB Joint Advisory Committee.

80. 150799 - 33 BODENHAM ROAD, HEREFORD

(Proposed demolition of existing dwelling together with its detached garage and accommodation over to facilitate a purpose designed residential apartment building (8 Flats) together with associated car parking, cycle/bin stores and associated communal grounds.)

The Acting Principal Planning Officer gave a presentation on the application, and updates/additional representations received following the publication of the agenda were provided in the update sheet, as appended to these Minutes.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the local ward member, Councillor Mrs MD Lloyd-Hayes, spoke on the application.

She made the following principal comments:

- She had received a significant amount of correspondence on the application.
- The site was in a conservation area. The proposal was detrimental. It was out of keeping with the character of the area and contrary to policy HBA6.
- The scale of the development was out of proportion. It was three storeys high and overbearing.
- The modern design was incompatible with the Edwardian and Victorian buildings along Bodenham Road.
- The side of Bodenham Road where the site was situated had not been subject to modern development.
- The density of development with eight apartments proposed was too intensive and again out of keeping with the area.
- The eight apartments proposed would generate additional traffic. Bodenham Road was already facing increased pressure as a result of the new link road.
- It was questioned whether the 9 car parking spaces proposed would be sufficient. There was no on street parking available. The proposal was contrary to policy H16.
- The existing building was much lower than that proposed. The proposal would have an adverse effect on the light and amenity value of an adjoining property and the street.
- Reference was made in the report to the protection of trees on the site during construction work. Assurance was sought that these trees would be retained through Tree Preservation Orders.
- The Waste Management Service had commented that it was likely that the contractor would refuse to collect refuse from the bin store as currently located on the plans.
- Hereford City Council had objected to both the original and amended plans.
- Paragraph 5.2 of the report summarised the representations made in the letters of objection that had been received.
- The area was an attractive part of the City. Any development in such an area should be required to benefit and enhance it.
- There was some question about a drain crossing the application site.

In the Committee's discussion of the application the following principal points were made:

- The Acting Principal Planning Officer commented that the proposed building would not have an unduly overbearing or overshadowing impact on adjoining properties. She confirmed that Tree Preservation Orders would protect trees on the site. The

provision of 9 car parking spaces met highway standards. Cycle storage was also provided. There was restricted parking on Bodenham Road. In considering the application of policy HBA6 regard had to be had to paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The benefit of the development in a sustainable location outweighed any harm for the reasons set out in the report. In relation to waste collection residents could take waste bins to the roadside for the collection as was the case with a number of other properties in the area. Welsh Water had not identified any drains crossing the site.

- The development would provide much needed housing in the city.
- The existing building on the site was of poor design and without merit. The new development might be considered an enhancement.
- Some Members considered the modern design of the proposed development was acceptable. Another considered the design could have been improved.
- A Member requested that if the application were to be approved consideration should be given to providing a pedestrian crossing on Bodenham Road. The local ward member commented that this was already in hand.

The Development Manager reported that the building was to be designed to the highest energy efficiency standards. He acknowledged that the scheme was for a modern building, however, the applicant had a good record in this regard. There were other modern buildings in the area. The existing building had no merit and was inefficient in terms of energy usage. The proposal met highway requirements and was sustainable with ready access to the city. It also preserved the Conservation Area.

The local ward member was given the opportunity to close the debate. She commented on the importance of preserving the conservation area and that the proposal was not an attractive development of the type that would be welcome.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. **A01 Time limit for commencement (full permission) - One Year**
2. **B03 Amended plans – recommendations of the Tree Survey and Arboricultural Report**
3. **C01 Samples of external materials – Amended (No development other than demolition)**
4. **H13 Access, turning area and parking**
5. **G09 Details of Boundary treatments – Prior to the occupation of any of the units...**
6. **Other than demolition no other development shall be carried out until a site plan and written specification clearly describing the species, densities and planting numbers and giving details of cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass established has been submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. The soft landscaping shall be carried out concurrently with the development hereby permitted and shall be completed no later than the first planting season following the completion**

of the development. The landscaping shall be maintained for a period of 5 years. During this time, any trees, shrubs or other plants which are removed, die or are seriously retarded shall be replaced during the next planting season with others of similar sizes and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation. If any plants fail more than once they shall continue to be replaced on an annual basis until the end of the 5-year maintenance period.

Reason: In order to maintain the visual amenities of the area and to comply with Policy LA6 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan

7. **Before development commences parking for site operatives and visitors shall be provided within the application site in accordance with drawing 5107-17-11 and such provision shall be retained and kept available during construction of the development.**

Reason: To prevent indiscriminate parking in the interests of highway safety and to conform with the requirements of Policy DR3 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

8. **Prior to the first occupation of any of the units hereby permitted the cycle parking and waste and recycling bin store provision shown on drawings 5107-17-4d, 5107-17-8 and 5107-17-9a shall be installed and thereafter made available for such use.**

Reason: To ensure that there is adequate provision for secure cycle accommodation and waste and recycling storage within the application site, encouraging alternative modes of transport and appropriate waste storage in accordance with both local and national planning policy and to conform with the requirements of Policies DR1 and DR3 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

9. **L01 Foul/surface water drainage**
10. **L02 No surface water to connect to public system**
11. **L03 No drainage run-off to public system**
12. **F17 Obscure glazing to windows - northwest elevation**

INFORMATIVES:

1. **The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against planning policy and any other material considerations. Negotiations in respect of matters of concern with the application (as originally submitted) have resulted in amendments to the proposal. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.**
2. **HN10 No drainage to discharge to highway**
3. **HN05 Works within the highway**

81. 151121 - LAND OFF HIGH STREET, LEINTWARDINE, HEREFORDSHIRE

(Proposed residential development of 10 no dwellings.)

The Principal Planning Officer gave a presentation on the application, and updates/additional representations received following the publication of the agenda were provided in the update sheet, as appended to these Minutes.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr M Collins, of Leintwardine Group Parish Council spoke in opposition to the Scheme. Mr A Stewart, the applicant's agent, spoke in support.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the local ward member, Councillor CA Gandy, spoke on the application.

She commented that the access to the site was expected to be via the access created for the doctor's surgery and would mean residents of the new dwellings driving through the surgery car park. The surgery was used by a number of elderly people and she was concerned that this would present a risk to safety. Some form of traffic management together with signage would be needed to ensure that traffic travelling to and from the dwellings had to slow down.

In the Committee's discussion of the application the following principal points were made:

- It was observed that the development contained no affordable housing. The Development Manager commented that the density of the development was equivalent to 25 dwellings per hectare. He added that Leintwardine had achieved its allocation of affordable housing and there was no current need to be met.
- Some members expressed concern about the shared access. The Development Manager commented that the application was an outline application. The Committee therefore only needed to consider the principle of development. Access and other transportation matters including pedestrian access would be considered at the reserved matters stage. The Transportation Manager had no objections to the application.
- The intention to provide bungalows within the development was welcomed.
- The size of the development was comparatively modest and more acceptable than some other proposals that had come before the Committee.
- Note should be taken of the concerns expressed by the Parish Council that the settlement would have an adverse affect on the setting of the village.
- If approved the developer should be required to build to the highest achievable standards.
- Account should be taken of the comments of the Conservation Manager – Landscape regarding the siting of house plots number 6 and 10 and their proximity to the hedgerow.

The Development Manager commented that the development represented organic growth and it was to be hoped that concerns raised by Members could be addressed at the reserved matters stage.

The local ward member was given the opportunity to close the debate and reiterated her concerns about the safety of the access.

RESOLVED: That Subject to the completion of a Section 106 Town & Country Planning Act 1990 obligation agreement in accordance with the Heads of Terms stated in the report (subject to the deletion of paragraph 4), officers named in the Scheme of Delegation to Officers are authorised to grant outline planning permission, subject to the conditions below and any other further conditions considered necessary.

1. **A01 Time limit for commencement (full permission)**
2. **A03 Time limit for commencement (outline permission)**
3. **A04 Approval of reserved matters**
4. **C01 Samples of external materials**
5. **The development shall include no more than 10 dwellings with a combined floor area not in excess of 1,000 square metres. None of the dwellings shall be more than two storeys high. In accordance with the details submitted with the application, at least four of the dwellings shall be bungalows.**

Reason: To define the terms of the permission and to conform to Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan Policies S1, DR1, H13 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

6. **H11 Parking – estate development (more than one house)**
7. **H18 On site roads – submission of details**
8. **H20 Road completion**
9. **H21 Wheel washing**
10. **H27 Parking for site operatives**
11. **H29 Covered and secure cycle parking provision**
12. **The recommendations set out in the ecologist's report from Turnstone dated April 2015 should be followed unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Prior to commencement of the development, a habitat protection and enhancement scheme integrated with the landscape scheme should be submitted to and be approved in writing by the local planning authority, The scheme should include a timetable for completion of habitat protection and enhancement measures and they shall be implemented as approved.**

An appropriately qualified and experienced ecological clerk of works should be appointed (or consultant engaged in that capacity) to oversee the ecological mitigation work.

Reason: To ensure that all species are protected having regard to the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 and Policies NC1, NC6 and NC7 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan. To comply with Herefordshire

Council's Policy NC8 and NC9 in relation to Nature Conservation and Biodiversity and to meet the requirements of the NPPF and the NERC Act 2006.

- 13. G04 Protection of trees/hedgerows that are to be retained**
- 14. G09 Details of boundary treatments**
- 15. G10 Landscaping scheme**
- 16. G11 Landscaping scheme - implementation**
- 17. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved the following details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:**
 - A detailed surface water drainage strategy that includes drawings and calculations that demonstrate consideration of SUDS techniques, no surface water flooding up to the 1 in 30 year event and no increased risk of flooding as a result of development up to the 1 in 100 year event and allowing for the potential effects of climate change;**
 - A detailed foul water management strategy;**
 - Proposals for the adoption and maintenance of the surface and foul water drainage systems. Prior to construction we would also require the following information to be provided;**
 - Results of infiltration testing undertaken in accordance with BRE365 and results of recorded groundwater levels, noting that the base of any infiltration structure should be a minimum of 1m above the highest recorded groundwater level.**

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that effective drainage facilities are provided for the development and that no adverse impacts occur to the environment or the existing public sewerage system so as to comply with Policy CF2 of the Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan and the NPPF.

- 18. E01 Site investigation – archaeology**

Informatives:

- 1. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against planning policy and any other material considerations, including any representations that have been received. It has subsequently determined to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.**
- 2. HN10 No drainage to discharge to highway**
- 3. HN08 Section 38 Agreement & Drainage details**

4. **HN07 Section 278 Agreement**
5. **HN01 Mud on highway**
6. **HN28 Highway Design Guide and Specification**

(The meeting adjourned between 3.20pm and 3.30pm.)

82. 151627- LAND ADJOINING BRYANTS COURT COTTAGE, GOODRICH HEREFORDSHIRE

(Proposed erection of two detached cottages with new vehicular access.)

The Acting Principal Planning Officer gave a presentation on the application, and updates/additional representations received following the publication of the agenda were provided in the update sheet, as appended to these Minutes. He reported that Goodrich Parish Council no longer objected to the proposal.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Ms R Chatterton, a local resident, spoke in objection to the scheme. Mr P Smith, the applicant's agent, spoke in support.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the local ward member, Councillor PD Newman, spoke on the application.

- He made the following principal comments:
- The Parish Council had objected to the original application. A revised scheme, reduced in size, had been submitted and the Parish Council had withdrawn its objection to the development. He supported the Parish Council's view. The development respected the integrity of the village and was appropriate.

In the Committee's discussion of the application the following principal points were made:

- Members noted the Parish Council's support for the development.
- The Development Manager confirmed that a high quality of design was expected within the AONB and that design of the scheme would be considered at the reserved matters stage.
- In relation to objections that had been expressed about the impact on amenity and privacy of adjoining dwellings the Acting Principal Planning Officer commented that these were some 37 and 24 metres away on the opposite side of the highway, and separated from the proposed development by landscaping.

The local ward member was given the opportunity to close the debate. He had no additional comments.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. **A02 Time limit for submission of reserved matters**
2. **A03 Time limit for commencement (outline permission)**
3. **A04 Approval of reserved matters**

4. **A05 Plans and particulars of reserved matters**
5. **Foul water and surface water discharges shall be drained separately from the site.**

Reason: To protect the integrity of the public sewerage system.

6. **No surface water shall be allowed to connect, either directly or indirectly, to the public sewerage system unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: To prevent hydraulic overloading of the public sewerage system, to protect the health and safety of existing residents and ensure no detriment to the environment.

7. **H03 Visibility splays – should meet HC design guide for single private drives.**
8. **H06 Vehicular access construction**
9. **H09 Driveway gradient**
10. **H12 Parking and turning - single house**
11. **H17 Junction improvement/off site works**
12. **H21 Wheel washing**
13. **H27 Parking for site operatives**
14. **H29 Secure covered cycle parking provision**
15. **G03 Retention of existing trees/hedgerows: scope of information required**
16. **G04 Protection of trees/hedgerows that are to be retained**
17. **G09 Details of Boundary treatments**
18. **G10 Landscaping scheme**
19. **G11 Landscaping scheme – implementation**
20. **I16 Restriction of hours during construction**

INFORMATIVES:

1. **The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against planning policy and any other material considerations, including any representations that have been received. It has subsequently determined to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.**
2. **HN01 Mud on highway**

3. **HN04 Private apparatus within highway**
4. **HN05 Works within the highway**
5. **HN08 Section 38 Agreement & Drainage details**
6. **HN10 No drainage to discharge to highway**
7. **HN22 Works adjoining highway**
8. **HN28 Highways Design Guide and Specification**

83. 152084 - NEW FIELD GATE ADJACENT TO THE OLD CHAPEL , TILLINGTON COMMON, TILLINGTON HEREFORDSHIRE

(Proposed installation of gate into field.)

The Planning Officer gave a presentation on the application.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. **A01 Time limit for commencement (full permission)**
2. **B01 Development in accordance with the approved plans**
3. **H05 Access gates open inwards**

INFORMATIVES:

1. **The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against planning policy and any other material considerations, including any representations that have been received. It has subsequently determined to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.**

84. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Planning Committee noted the date of the next meeting.

Appendix 1 - Schedule of Updates

The meeting ended at 3.55 pm

CHAIRMAN

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: 7 October 2015

AFTERNOON

Schedule of Committee Updates/Additional Representations

Note: The following schedule represents a summary of the additional representations received following the publication of the agenda and received up to midday on the day before the Committee meeting where they raise new and relevant material planning considerations.

150799 - PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING TOGETHER WITH ITS DETACHED GARAGE AND ACCOMMODATION OVER TO FACILITATE A PURPOSE DESIGNED RESIDENTIAL APARTMENT BUILDING (8 FLATS) TOGETHER WITH ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING, CYCLE/BIN STORES AND ASSOCIATED COMMUNAL GROUNDS. AT 33 BODENHAM ROAD, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE,

For: Perfection Homes per Mr D F Baume, Hook Mason Ltd, 41 Widemarsh Street, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR4 9EA

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

Following consultations on the amended plans the following representations have been received:

Conservation Manager: The latest south elevation drawing is an improvement. The copper shingles would add some texture giving that elevation interest and tying in with the materials used on the street elevation.

Two letters of objection. The main points raised are:

- Report is incorrect where it states (para 6.10) that the proposed building would not have an unduly overbearing nor overshadowing impact, because the new building and the existing Rydal Mount will sandwich The Coach House and effectively enclose it and severely restrict natural light and front garden will be entirely overshadowed by the new building.
- Impact of the new building is worsened by the difference, about 2 metres, in level which is not shown on the drawings.
- Para 6.7 contains the following misleading and incorrect comment "...the two and three storey sections (of the new building) would not be taller than the relative adjacent buildings." This clearly refers to Rydal Mount to the east and ignores The Coach House which is actually next to the new building and is much, much lower than Rydal Mount. The Coach House is not shown on the elevations submitted.
- Disappointing that the previous 'object' recommendation by the Council has been changed after nothing more than very token changes to the original application.
- Amendments to the south elevation do not overcome objection – the building would be out of character with the area.
- Balconies have not been deleted, so privacy still adversely affected.
- Concern about the height and appearance of the cycle store, close to the boundary, even with a 2 metre high fence
- Front elevation of building would be forward of the existing dwelling on the site, contrary to policy
- Approval would set a precedent.

OFFICER COMMENTS

At paragraph 6.7 the reference to the height of the adjacent buildings is made in respect of the impact of the proposed building in the Conservation Area. Due to the setback nature of The Coach House, compared to Rydal Mount and the proposed building, it would not be read in conjunction with it from Bodenham Road. The assessment of the impact on the neighbouring properties is set out in paragraph 6.10.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

No change to recommendation, but the following amendments to conditions are recommended:

- Condition 2 – include cycle store and bin store drawing reference numbers.
- Condition 7 – delete requirement to submit details, as they have been received.
- Condition 8 - include the provision of the bin store prior to first occupation and include drawing numbers.

151121 - PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF 10 NO DWELLINGS AT LAND OFF HIGH STREET, LEINTWARDINE, HEREFORDSHIRE

For: Mr Stewart per Mr Alastair Stewart, 7 Sweetlake Business Park, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY3 9EW

OFFICER COMMENTS

Core Strategy

The Inspector's Report into the Core Strategy has been received. The policies of the Core Strategy can now be given significant weight in decision taking. RA2 is relevant as guiding development in rural settlements. It states:-

"The minimum growth target in each rural Housing Market Area will be used to inform the level of housing development to be delivered in the various settlements set out in Figures 4.20 and 4.21. Neighbourhood Development Plans will allocate land for new housing or otherwise demonstrate delivery to provide levels of housing to meet the various targets.

Housing proposals will be permitted where the following criteria are met:

- 1. Their design and layout should reflect the size, role and function of each settlement and be located within or adjacent to the main built up area. In relation to smaller settlements identified in fig 4.21 proposals will be expected to demonstrate particular attention to the form, layout, character and setting of the site and its location in that settlement; and/or they result in development that contributes to or is essential to the social well-being of the settlement concerned;*
- 2. Their locations make best and full use of suitable brownfield sites wherever possible;*
- 3. They result in the development of high quality, sustainable schemes which are appropriate to their context and make a positive contribution to the surrounding environment and its landscape setting; and*
- 4. They result in the delivery of schemes that generate the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular settlement, reflecting local demand.*

Specific proposals for the delivery of local need housing will be particularly supported where they meet an identified need and their long-term retention as local needs housing is secured as such."

In this case the NDP is not adopted. In the absence of a NDP, the development's conformity with the numbered criteria of Core Strategy Policy RA2 is the appropriate method of determination. In this instance, officers have failed to identify overriding harm in the context

of Policy RA2. The proposal is therefore representative of sustainable development when held against both the NPPF and Core Strategy.

It will also be noted from the original report that the application has been recommended for approval subject to draft heads of terms, including a commuted sum in lieu of on-site affordable housing provision. However, following the receipt of the Inspector's Report, and in particular paragraph 39, it is recommended that paragraph 4 of the draft heads of terms agreement be deleted:

While the WMS thresholds no longer carry weight, the examination of the CS was based on the modified policy. The modified threshold formed the basis of supplementary evidence considering viability (Herefordshire viability testing supplementary report Feb 2015) the effect on the provision of affordable housing throughout the county and was consulted upon. The policy, as modified would be effective and bring forward affordable housing, although less so in the rural areas than the submission policy. However, as the submission policy was not tested during the examination I find MM042 necessary to ensure that the Plan has a viable and sound affordable housing policy. If the Council wish to return to the submission policy they have the option of carrying out an early Plan review for policy H1.

On the basis that the proposal will deliver ten dwellings and that their combined floor area will be limited to 1,000 square metres it is also recommended that condition 5 is amended.

CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

Condition 5 is amended to read:

The development shall include no more than 10 dwellings with a combined floor area not in excess of 1,000 square metres. None of the dwellings shall be more than two storeys high. In accordance with the details submitted with the application, at least four of the dwellings shall be bungalows.

Paragraph four of the Draft Heads of Terms Agreement to be deleted.

151627 - PROPOSED ERECTION OF TWO DETACHED COTTAGES WITH NEW VEHICULAR ACCESS AT LAND ADJOINING BRYANTS COURT COTTAGE, GOODRICH, HEREFORDSHIRE,

For: Mr Holey and Ms S Lawrence per Mr Paul Smith, First Floor, 41 Bridge Street, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR4 9DG

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

Core Strategy

The Inspector's Report into the Core Strategy has been received. The policies of the Core Strategy can now be given significant weight in decision taking. RA2 is relevant as guiding development in rural settlements. It states:-

"The minimum growth target in each rural Housing Market Area will be used to inform the level of housing development to be delivered in the various settlements set out in Figures 4.20 and 4.21. Neighbourhood Development Plans will allocate land for new housing or otherwise demonstrate delivery to provide levels of housing to meet the various targets.

Housing proposals will be permitted where the following criteria are met:

- 1. Their design and layout should reflect the size, role and function of each settlement and be located within or adjacent to the main built up area. In relation to smaller settlements identified in fig 4.21 proposals will be expected to demonstrate particular attention to the form, layout, character and setting of the site and its location in that settlement; and/or they result in development that contributes to or is essential to the social well-being of the settlement concerned;*
- 2. Their locations make best and full use of suitable brownfield sites wherever possible;*
- 3. They result in the development of high quality, sustainable schemes which are appropriate to their context and make a positive contribution to the surrounding environment and its landscape setting; and*
- 4. They result in the delivery of schemes that generate the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular settlement, reflecting local demand.*

Specific proposals for the delivery of local need housing will be particularly supported where they meet an identified need and their long-term retention as local needs housing is secured as such.”

In this case the NDP is not adopted. In the absence of a NDP, the development's conformity with the numbered criteria of Core Strategy Policy RA2 is the appropriate method of determination. In this instance, officers have failed to identify overriding harm in the context of Policy RA2. The proposal is therefore representative of sustainable development when held against both the NPPF and Core Strategy.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

