

ITEM NO:

<u>Location:</u>	Mill Corner Farm Jacksons Lane Reed Royston Hertfordshire SG8 8AB
<u>Applicant:</u>	Rand Brothers
<u>Proposal:</u>	Permission in Principle: Erection of seven dwellings
<u>Ref. No:</u>	20/01605/PIP
<u>Officer:</u>	Sam Dicocco

Date of expiry of statutory period: 31/08/2020

Submitted Plan Nos: Site Location Plan

Extension of statutory period: 18/09/2020

Reason for referral to Committee: Residential development on a site in excess of 0.5 hectares.

1.0 **Relevant History**

1.1 None applicable for the site. Following review of neighbour notification responses, the following list of applications and appeals on land adjoining the site are of interest –

Reed House, Jacksons Lane

- 1.2 04/01397/1 - Outline Application: Erection of 24 detached and terraced dwellings with garaging, open space, estate road and formation of vehicular accesses onto Jackson's Lane and The Joint. (Design, external appearance and landscaping reserved) – Refused 29/09/2004 – Appeal Dismissed 27/04/2005.
- 1.3 11/02254/1 - Erection of 13 dwellings (outline application - appearance, landscaping and scale reserved) – Refused 25/11/2011 – Appeal Dismissed 22/08/2012
- 1.4 13/01999/1 - Erection of 13 dwellings and a business / I.T building (outline application - appearance, landscaping and scale reserved) – Refused 28/03/2014 – Appeal Dismissed 15/05/2014
- 1.5 15/02724/1 - Outline application: Erection of 12 dwellings (all matters except access reserved) – Refused 22/02/2016 – Appeal Dismissed 03/08/2016

1.6 The proposed development will be considered on its own merits. That being said, the proximity of these previously refused schemes on a nearby development site makes it material in respect to the principle of residential development. A continuous trend in the appeals is the issue of reliance on private motorised vehicles, contrary to the principle of actively managing patterns of growth to make the fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling and reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

2.0 **Policies**

2.1 **North Hertfordshire Local Plan No.2 with Alterations**

LP6 – Rural Areas Beyond the Green Belt

LP26 - Housing Proposals

LP29 - Rural Housing Needs

LP29A - Affordable Housing for Urban Local Need

LP55 - Car Parking Standards

LP57 - Residential Guidelines and Standards

2.2 **National Planning Policy Framework**

SECN5 - Delivering sufficient supply of homes

SECN9 - Promoting sustainable transport

SECN11 - Making effective use of land

SECN12 - Achieving well-designed place

SECN16 - Conserve + enhance historic environment

2.3 **Supplementary Planning Documents**

Design Supplementary Planning Document

Vehicle Parking at New Developments Supplementary Planning Document

2.4 **North Hertfordshire Draft Local Plan 2011-2031**

XCGB1 - Rural Areas Beyond the Green Belt

XCBG2 - Exception Sites in Rural Areas

XD1 - Sustainable Design

XD3 - Protecting Living Conditions

XD4 - Air Quality

XHE1 - Designated Heritage Assets

XHS1 - Local Housing Allocations

XHS3 - Housing Mix

XHS5 - Accessible and Adaptable Housing

XNE1 – Landscape

XNE8 - Sustainable Drainage System

XNE12 - Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Dev

XSP1 - Sustainable Development in NH

XSP2 - Settlement Hierarchy

XSP5 - Countryside and Green Belt

XSP6 - Sustainable Transport

XSP8 – Housing

XSP9 - Design and Sustainability

XSP13 - Historic Environment

XT1 - Assessment of Transport Matters

XT2 – Parking

3.0 **Representations**

3.1 **Site Notices: 05/08/2020 Expiry: 28/08/2020**
Press Notice: N/A Expiry: N/A

Consultee responses

Reed Parish Council – Objection

- “a) Housing Development on this site would cause significant harm to the Reed Conservation Area and the environment in Reed.*
- b) Development on the site would seriously harm heritage in Reed and have adverse effect on the wider landscape, contrary to the NPPF and Local Planning policies, including Hertfordshire District Local Plan No. 2 saved Policy 6.*
- c) The location of the application on site conflicts with Policy SP2 in the NHDC Emergent Local Plan, in being outside the Reed Settlement Boundary.*
- d) The site is not one of the two sites in Reed allocated for housing development in the Emergent Local Plan. Furthermore, consistency in the planning process requires refusal for most of the same reasons which determined 4 refused applications (supported by 4 appeal decisions) for an adjacent site on Jacksons Lane, at Reed House.*
- e) Given the limited amenities and the existing strain on infrastructure in Reed (with notice already received by the PC of pending further infill development within the Reed settlement boundary) this development is not a sustainable addition to the village.*
- f) The application meets the refusal criterion for prematurity in the NPPF because consent would prejudice the outcome of the plan making process (NPPF 49a).*
- g) Granting this PIP would be a precedent for development on other fields outside the settlement boundary to the north of Reed, with the adverse effect of irreversibly changing the distinctive shape and character of the village. This latter is an essential heritage value which conservation status and Reed's designation as a category A village in the settlement hierarchy and the NPPF (170b 192b) should all protect.*
- h) The application is hostile in the sense used in North Herts. Examination Documents to the Inspector of January and August 2020, which submit proposals for a solution to the District's 5 year Housing Supply problem para 31 ED178 Jan. Aug. 2020 The present application opportunistically seeks to exploit a delay in the completion of examination of the Local Plan resulting from the Covid Emergency. Granting it licences unplanned and unsustainable development that undermines the integrity of the Plan led system. para 30 ED178 This is the case because the application proposes indiscriminate, inappropriate, development in this location and will lead cumulatively, to applications on fields like it in Reed initially those to the east of the proposed site. It makes a minimal difference to overall housing supply in the District and confers no benefit which outweighs harm caused in Reed. As such it should be refused and, if necessary, resisted on appeal.*
- i) The proposed access opposite the school would be unsafe.*
- j) It is in conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework on sustainability grounds, because it would increase private car use in Reed, as well as overburdening existing, inadequate infrastructure.”*

Local Highways Authority – No objection subject to conditions.

Public representations

44 neighbour responses have been received. 43 of the responses are generally in objection to the proposed development. Key points raised follow:

Harm to the Reed Conservation Area and the environment in Reed

Harm to the wider landscape

The location of the application site is outside the Reed Settlement Boundary

Consistency in the planning process with a history of refused applications and dismissed appeals in the area

The development is not a sustainable addition to the village

"prejudice the outcome of the plan-making process" (NPPF 49a)

Setting of a precedent

Opportunistic timing in respect to un-expected delays to the ELP and summer holidays

The proposed access opposite the school would be unsafe and promote additional traffic on a narrow lane

Reliance on private car use

Overburdening existing, inadequate infrastructure

12 new houses have been built in very close proximity with struggling sales rate so there is little demand for these houses from the local population

Affinity Water need to provide a reliable water pressure to this end of the village

There is land already identified in the Local Plan for development in Reed on Blacksmith Lane

The flood risk for the site itself does not consider the increased risk of flooding on Jacksons Lane caused by the removal of the meadow

Loss of privacy

This proposal within this application comes at significant cost to the environment, local infrastructure, culture and heritage of the village, the small minor, short term benefits put forward by the application do not outweigh these detrimental effects and therefore this stage 1 PIP should be refused

One letter of support has been received as a result of public notification. The support letter states there is a clear need for dwellings in the area quoting the existing five-year housing land supply position of the Council. The letter continues to state that the application site is suitable for development, bring opposite the school and near the village bus stop.

A representation was made by CPRE - Objection – Absence of 5 year housing land supply does supersede Local Plan policies – Substantial weight can be afforded to ELP – Prematurity – Site is not allocated – Not within the settlement boundary – Reliance on private motor vehicles not sustainable – Conservation Area is a matter of principle.

Councillor Gerald Morris wrote in support of the Parish Councils objection, requesting that the application be called into committee if the case officer was minded to recommend approval

4.0 **Planning Considerations**

4.1 **Site and Surroundings**

- 4.1.1 The site lies within the Rural Area beyond the Green Belt as designated by the Saved Local Plan 2007 (SLP). Furthermore, a section of the site fronting Jacksons Lane, between 18m and 25m deep, is designated as a Conservation Area within the SLP. These site designations are not proposed to be altered in the 2011-2031 Proposed Submission Local Plan (as amended) (ELP) currently under examination.
- 4.1.2 The plot is T shaped, with a narrow frontage onto Jacksons Lane widening at set points as it expands northwards. The plot is located between a detached dwelling to the west and Vine Cottage to the east, and its extent wraps around the gardens of these residential dwellings. The site has a depth of approximately 116m. The application form states the site area is 0.78 hectares.
- 4.1.3 The sites existing boundary treatment to Jacksons Lane is a verdant mix of hedging, shrubbery and trees. A mature tree exists to the rear of the boundary sited centrally within the width of the plots frontage onto Jacksons Lane. The boundary to the east alongside the original plot of Vine Cottage is green and mature, then being composed of low level open fencing to the extended garden area. The west boundary of the site approaches the side boundary of the detached dwelling to the west and new dwellings off Brickyard Lane. Approximately half of the north boundary of the site is delineated by a small hedgerow and some more mature trees, however, there is a section with no marked delineation between the site and land to the north approaching The Joint.
- 4.1.4 The sites surroundings are mixed. The site is between dwellings, and there is some residential character to the sites surroundings, Reed has an open and agricultural setting.

4.2 **Proposal**

- 4.2.1 The application seeks permission in principle for the erection of seven dwellings. It is incumbent on the LPA to specify the maximum and minimum number of dwellings which are, in principle, permitted, if minded to approve.

4.3 **Key Issues**

- 4.3.1 Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) explains that permission in principle is an alternative way of obtaining planning permission for housing led development as part of a two-stage procedure. Permission in principle, at the initial stage, is limited to the consideration of location, land use and the amount of development which, in the event of an approval, would leave the remaining matters to be considered in a technical details application.
- 4.3.2 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that applications for planning permission, and therefore appeals and permission in principle, must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Framework comments that where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan, it should not usually be granted. Only if material considerations in a particular case indicate that the plan should not be followed should they be permitted.

- 4.3.3 The main issue for consideration in this recommendation is, therefore, whether the proposal, in respect to land use and amount of development, would be in a suitable location, having regard to local and national planning policies.
- 4.3.4 The site lies within the Rural Area beyond the Green Belt. Consequently, policy 6 of the SLP is applicable. Policy 6 of the Saved Local Plan (SLP) accords with the NPPF in its aim to recognise and protect the intrinsic value of the countryside, with specific but not exclusively respect of paragraph 170 (b), in its aim to promote this principle and paragraph 127 as it relates to design and the need to respect landscape setting. Consequently, whilst time expired, it is not considered to be out-of-date and significant weight is afforded to policy 6 in this regard.
- 4.3.5 Policy 26 of the SLP states that housing proposals will be permitted, among other criteria, beyond allocated sites and residential areas if the proposal is acceptable in that location within the environment and character of the existing area. Reading the SLP as a whole, Policy 26 should be interpreted in the context of Policy 6.
- 4.3.6 The proposed development would not be strictly necessary for the needs of agriculture, forestry or any proven need for local community services. No evidence has been provided that the development would meet an identified rural housing need in compliance with policy 29 or affordable housing need in line with policy 29(a). The development would not be a single dwelling on a small plot, and even if a single dwelling were considered under this application, it would have an adverse impact on the local environment (discussed later within this report). The proposal would not involve a change to the rural economy in line with policies 24 or 25. Consequently, the proposed permission in principle would be contrary to policy 6 of the SLP.
- 4.3.7 Whilst the site could be considered 'elsewhere' under the terms of policy 26 of the SLP, as discussed in greater detail below, the amount and land use proposed would not be acceptable in this location in my view, failing to conform with the environment and character of the area. As such, the principle of the residential development of the site would be contrary to policy 26.
- 4.3.8 As stated above, no evidence has been provided that the land use would be for a specific and proven local need. Furthermore, no evidence has or could be provided that any need evidenced could not be met in any other way, considering the allocation of land for housing in Reed within the Emerging Local Plan (ELP). Whilst other requirements of policy 29 could, in theory, be satisfied, the land use and amount of development would not be visually sympathetic to the existing character of the settlement to which it would relate in my judgement.
- 4.3.9 Policy 55 of the SLP for car parking standards is not pertinent at this stage of the permission in principle procedure.
- 4.3.10 Policy 57 aims to inform design in relation to the sites context, and guide development in respect layout, access, scale, and other detailed matters. Whilst some of these matters may not be considered relevant to this stage of the permission in principle route to planning permission, there are some aspects which I consider remain key in establishing the acceptability of the use and amount of development proposed in this location.

These are the likely impact of any development of this use and amount on the established character of the site and sites surroundings, as well as the impact of the land use and amount of development on the Conservation Area.

- 4.3.11 Reed Conservation Area is set within a wider landscape of open farmland. The village is surrounded by farmland and an associated network of winding lanes and footpaths. Scattered farmsteads and wayside dwellings complete the rural setting of Reed Conservation Area. The Conservation Area can be characterised by extensive tracts of agricultural land with a low density of historic and modern buildings fronting country lanes. Reed Conservation Area is highly rural with a strong sense of openness and countryside setting.
- 4.3.12 Buildings are mostly scattered along various country lanes, often with an abundance of space in between properties. There is a slight increase in density of housing in the northern parts of the Conservation Area. Namely, along both sides of Jackson's Lane, Crow Lane and Brickyard Lane.
- 4.3.13 The area of central open agricultural land, surrounded by country lanes and historic cottages, farm buildings and moated sites, is a focal point for the Conservation Area. The narrow country lanes, enclosed by thick hedgerow and trees, provide green avenues which connect the modern housing, historic cottages and farmsteads to the church and country houses and are thus are a distinctive and integral part of the village. Additional surrounding farmland bounds the village and provides a countryside setting. The confined country lanes, tightly bounded by thick hedgerows and veteran tree coverage, creates a peaceful experience which positively contribute to the rural character of Reed Conservation Area.
- 4.3.14 The proposed land use and amount of development would necessitate an access point, vehicular and pedestrian, through and into Reed Conservation Area. Further to the access, built form will be required in the form of dwellings in an area otherwise agrarian in character. Whilst the amount of development could be subject to change at the behest of the LPA, the land use would fundamentally alter the character of the location from open, countryside and agrarian in character, for which no technical details could overcome.
- 4.3.15 The land use and amount of development proposed would incontrovertibly alter the existing contribution of the site to the significance of the Conservation Area. The access, land use and amount of development would disrupt to the contribution of Jacksons Lane as a confined country lane tightly bounded by thick hedgerows contributing to the rural character of Reed. The site currently breaks up built form along Jacksons Lane, identified as slightly higher in density than other lanes in the Conservation Area. The slightly higher density of Jacksons Lane does not diminish the contribution of the currently undeveloped site to the scattered development along country lanes which reveals the relatively well preserved historic medieval development of the settlement.
- 4.3.16 I consider that the land use and amount of development would be inconsistent with the aims of section 16 of the NPPF and policy HE1 of the ELP in respect aims to preserve or enhancing the significance of heritage assets.

The sites current open, agrarian, countryside character assists in enclosing Reed as a settlement, and breaks up the development along Jacksons Lane, contributing to the scattered development pattern of Reed and its rural character. The harm to the contribution of the site to the significance of the heritage asset, in this instance, would be at the higher end of less than substantial in my view. The development would, even with mitigation through design secured at technical details stage, be almost entirely lost, however, the existing contribution itself is just under the threshold for what could be considered substantially harmful through loss.

- 4.3.17 In line with the above discussion, the proposed change of land use and amount of development would not respect the character and environment of the surrounding area, contrary to elements of policy 6 and 26 discussed earlier in this report, as well as policy 57 of the SLP.
- 4.3.18 The aim of policy 6 and policy 26 is to direct development towards settlements with greater facilities and services. These aims aligned to section 9 of the NPPF in leading the planning system to actively manage patterns of growth.
- 4.3.19 The location is not appropriate for the use in terms of promoting sustainable modes of transport. The previous appeal decisions on the adjacent site support this conclusion. I have no reason to come to an alternative conclusion in respect the reliance of occupiers of the proposed development on the private vehicular transport. There has not been any significant change in respect to availability of alternative transport modes within Reed since the 2016 appeal decision on the adjoining site.
- 4.3.20 Accordingly, the proposal would give rise to significant reliance on private transport, contrary to the aims of section 9 of the NPPF. This conflict with policy would cause significant harm in respect failure to fulfil the environmental role expressed within the NPPF.
- 4.3.21 The Local Highways Authority originally objected to the proposed development on the basis of insufficient information to satisfy that access can be provided onto Jacksons Lane in a safe manner. Subsequently, the LHA submitted no objection subject to conditions, on the basis that the information they required would constitute a technical detail. It is noted that conditions cannot be applied to permission in principle, but the details within could be added to any decision notice to inform subsequent technical detail applications in the event of approval.
- 4.3.22 Paragraph 48 of the NPPF advises that an emerging plan can be afforded weight according to:
- a) the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced its preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
 - b) the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
 - c) the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given)

- 4.3.23 The plan is well advanced and is at Examination, albeit completion of this process is reliant on the holding of further hearings following the issuing of detailed letters by the Inspector in the summer of 2019 (these hearings are due to take place in late September through October). These hearings have little bearing on relevant policies SP1, SP6, SP9, SP12, SP13, D1, D3, NE1, HE1 and CGB1 of the ELP, and as such, any outstanding objections are considered resolved. The hearings do have regard to the objective assessment of housing need and housing requirement, the supply of land for housing and the site selection process, among other things. As a result, it is not considered that outstanding objections to site allocations can be considered resolved. This limits the weight applicable to policies SP2, SP5, SP8, HS1 and, specific to Reed, RD1. Given the policies recent drafting, and modifications following hearing sessions, they are considered consistent with the policies in the framework.
- 4.3.24 It is noted that Reed is identified for some limited development in the ELP (as a category A settlement) within the newly proposed settlement boundary. This does not alter the view that Reed is not a settlement which boasts any services other than a first school. In any case, the site remains outside the village boundary as described in the ELP. Not all category A settlements are equal in terms of service provision. The category A settlement Ashwell for example has a school, surgery, dentist, pubs and various small shops. The harm occasioned to national and local policy objectives must be evaluated on a case by case basis for any category of settlement identified in the ELP.
- 4.3.25 The identification of a settlement in the ELP does not endow it with services not previously present. Category A settlements were selected principally because they retain a school as a minimum and it was considered sensible to direct some, tightly defined, development to these places on the assumption that it would be better to do this in planning terms than to have development in settlements with no social infrastructure whatsoever. In accepting modest development in Reed and other category A settlements, it is accepted and clear that there will be harm in terms of sustainability but that this harm will be offset to a greater of lesser degree by the presence of some social infrastructure, alongside the potential, in this case, for RD1 to provide mitigation against potential harm resultant from the sustainability of the location.
- 4.3.26 The categorisation of Reed as an A settlement does not lend support the proposed development in sustainability terms for the reasons given above. The policies relied upon to support the allocation of land for development in Reed are subject to unresolved objections subject to further hearings, and as such, the weight afforded to these policies is limited. Furthermore, the site in question is not within the settlement of Reed, thereby would conflict with the ELP in respect CGB1.
- 4.3.27 The Authority accepts that it cannot currently demonstrate a 5-year supply of housing land. Consequently, policies for the provision of housing are definitionally out-of-date having regard for footnote 7 which accompanies this paragraph of the NPPF. Notwithstanding the fact that several of the policies within the SLP remain considered in-date (whilst time expired) and thereby carry full weight, the 'basket' of relevant development plan policies most important in determining this housing application are considered out-of-date.

- 4.3.28 Footnote 6 accompanying paragraph 11(d)(i) makes it clear that designated heritage assets are 'areas or assets of particular importance' and that the relevant policies of the framework should be applied to development proposals where appropriate. In applying these policies, the protection of these areas must present a clear reason for refusal in order for paragraph 11(d)(i) to apply. The following assesses the non-tilted planning balance of harm to the heritage asset (identified above) against public benefits to see whether the engaged paragraph 11(d)(i), in application, would disapply limb (ii) and the tilted balance.
- 4.3.29 For ease, the harm identified earlier is considered at the higher end of less than substantial. The harm identified from the land use and amount of development in this location is loss or substantial damage to the rural, medieval, piecemeal, linear character of Reed Conservation Area and loss of agrarian setting and enclosure of the historic settlement.
- 4.3.30 The public benefits of the proposed development would be the social benefit of the provision of housing and the associated economic benefits of this delivery. Even on a neutral balance, regard must be had for the Councils five-year land supply in assigning weight to the public benefit of market housing. No affordable housing would be provided given the limited amount of development likely to be achieved on the site. The weight afforded to the provision of general market housing, in the context of the scale of potential delivery against need in the District and the progress of the ELP aiming to rectify the housing supply issue, is considered moderate. It does not outweigh the great weight to be afforded to the conservation of heritage assets, which are, at their basis, irreplaceable.
- 4.3.31 Given the clear reason for refusal resultant from the application of policies aimed to protect assets of particular importance, in this case designated heritage assets, limb (i) of paragraph 11(d) is satisfied. Consequently, the development should be refused, and other harm tested against benefits on a neutral balance.
- 4.3.32 Further harm must be added, as identified above, to the character of the landscape and area, as well as harm through reliance on private motorised transport and car-based development. The harm to the landscape character would be contrary to paragraph 170 (b) of the NPPF, policies 6 and 26 of the SLP and policies CGB1 and NE1 of the ELP. The inappropriate pattern of growth would lead to unsustainable modes of transport contrary to paragraph 103 of the NPPF, policies 6 and 26 of the SLP, and policies HS1, T1, SP1, SP2, SP6 and SP8 of the ELP.

4.4 **Conclusion**

- 4.4.1 By reason of the land use, location and amount of development, the proposed development would cause less than substantial harm to the contribution of the site to the significance of Reed Conservation Area. The public social benefits of market housing delivery and associated economic benefits does not outweigh the great weight afforded to the less than substantial harm to the heritage asset. Consequently, while the 'basket' of most relevant policies in determining the application are considered out-of-date, limb (i) of paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF is applied, and the development should be refused.

4.4.2 Further harm has been identified in respect to the impact of the land use, amount of development and location on the character of the landscape and the impact of the change of character on the character of the area, and reliance on private motorised vehicles for transportation running contrary to the environmental role expressed in the NPPF.

4.4.3 The proposed planning in principle should thereby be refused as it would be contrary to applicable policies in the development framework, and no other material considerations would indicate that a decision should be made to the contrary.

4.5 **Alternative Options**

4.5.1 None applicable

4.6 **Pre-Commencement Conditions**

4.6.1 None applicable.

5.0 **Legal Implications**

5.1 In making decisions on applications submitted under the Town and Country Planning legislation, the Council is required to have regard to the provisions of the development plan and to any other material considerations. The decision must be in accordance with the plan unless the material considerations indicate otherwise. Where the decision is to refuse or restrictive conditions are attached, the applicant has a right of appeal against the decision.

6.0 **Recommendation**

6.1 That permission in principle be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

1. The land use and amount of development proposed would manifestly diminish the contribution of the site to the significance of Reed Conservation Area. The land use and amount of development would require an access leading to an urban cul-de-sac where the current circumstances of the location contributes to the rural, countryside, agrarian, linear, scattered pattern of development which contributes materially to the significance of the Conservation Area as a medieval settlement ensconced by and enclosing agricultural land. The resultant harm would be at the upper end of 'less than substantial' and the great weight afforded to harm to heritage assets is not outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. The proposed permission in principle would thereby conflict with policy HE1 of the 2011-2031 Local Plan Proposed Submission (as amended by main modifications) and section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.
2. The proposed land use and amount of development would cause harm to the existing agrarian rural character of the site in terms of its verdant screening from and onto Jacksons Lane and the more open views from The Joint onto the site and into the settlement of Reed. The harm to the contribution of the landscape to the setting of Reed a would be irreversibly harmed by the land use and amount of development proposed in this location.

Consequently, the proposed permission in principle would be contrary to policies 6, 26 and 57 of the Saved Local Plan 2007, policies CGB1 and NE1 of the 2011-2031 Local Plan Proposed Submission (as amended by main modification) and sections 12 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

3. The proposed land use and amount of development, by reason of the rural location of the site, would give rise to significant reliance on private motorised vehicle to access day to day facilities and services. Such reliance would fail to satisfy the environmental objective promoted through the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 to direct development and growth to areas with good overall accessibility by a range of transport choices. Accordingly and in addition, the proposed development would be contrary to policies 6 and 26 of the Saved Local Plan 2007, policies T1, HS1, SP1, SP2, SP6 and SP8 of the 2011-2031 Local Plan Proposed Submission (as amended by main modifications), policy 5 of Local Transport Plan No.4 2018 and section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

Proactive Statement

Planning permission has been refused for this proposal for the clear reasons set out in this decision notice. The Council has not acted proactively through positive engagement with the applicant as in the Council's view the proposal is unacceptable in principle and the fundamental objections cannot be overcome through dialogue. Since no solutions can be found the Council has complied with the requirements of the Framework (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.