

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	<a href="#">P12/V1635/FUL</a>
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	FULL
<b>REGISTERED</b>	30 July 2012
<b>PARISH</b>	SHRIVENHAM
<b>WARD MEMBER(S)</b>	Simon Howell Elaine Ware
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Blue Cedar Retirement Homes Limited
<b>SITE</b>	Land near to Shrivenham Football Club Highworth Road Shrivenham
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Erection of 36 dwellings (comprising 10 open market, 12 for the over 55's age range and 14 affordable dwellings) with landscaping and associated infrastructure
<b>AMENDMENTS</b>	12 October 2012
<b>GRID REFERENCE</b>	423662/189121
<b>OFFICER</b>	David Rothery

---

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The 1.5ha site lies to the east of Highworth Road, on the outskirts of Shrivenham. The site lies within a large open field that undulates in cross-section and falls generally towards the south-east and further away to the north. The application site forms a corner of this larger field, and is formed by the creation of new boundaries and the sub-division of the field. Some existing natural features, such as a few trees and a hedgerow are incorporated within the proposed layout, with new hedgerow planting and drainage ditches proposed.
- 1.2 The adjoining land to the north and to the east of the application site is the remainder of the undulating field of which the application site forms part. To the south is located the enclosed football ground with floodlights, and some houses in a fairly loose-knit arrangement. The west of the site is bounded by Highworth Road, with residential properties along the opposite side of the road which forms the defined north-eastern village edge.
- 1.3 Due to the undulating nature of the land in this area, the site has views across open fields to the east towards St Andrews Church and the conservation area within Shrivenham, and to the north from places along the A420.
- 1.4 Local facilities lie 700m away in the village centre, a five to ten minute walk to the south and east of the site. Here there is the parish church, a post office, primary school, vehicle repair garage, pubs, restaurants, and shops.
- 1.5 The application comes to committee because Shrivenham Parish Council supports the proposal.
- 1.6 A location plan is **attached** at appendix 1.

## 2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.1 This is a full planning application for residential development of the site for 36 dwellings, 12 of which are intended as retirement homes for over 55 year old people. These properties are shown within a gated area with a manager's office/gatehouse and services store building. The main open space area is located within the gated area. The

remaining 19 dwellings and block of five flats make up the rest of the scheme of open market and affordable housing units.

2.2 The proposed mix of dwelling units is as follows:

- 1-bedroom = 4 units (all affordable) - provided as 3 flats and 1 coach-house
- 2-bedroomed = 8 units (6 affordable and 2 market) - shown as 2 flats and 6 houses
- 3-bedroomed = 18 units (4 affordable and 2 market and 12 secure sheltered)
- 4-bedroomed = 5 units (all open market)
- 5-bedroomed = 1 unit (open market)

The 36 dwellings would provide a total of 14 properties as affordable housing (39%). In addition, 12 would be provided as secure sheltered independent living housing for the over 55 year age range that the applicant business specialises in.

2.3 Across the 1.5 ha site the 36 dwelling units would produce a density of 24 dwellings per hectare. A total of 22% of the dwellings are two-bedroom properties or less although the 12 secure retirement dwellings are suggested as 2-3 bedroom units and if considered as 2-bedroomed would bring the total up to 55%.

2.4 The proposed housing comprises detached, semi-detached, and terraced houses of a traditional mix of one-and-a-half and two-storey appearance. The block of flats rises to three storeys including the roof space. House types A, B, C, D, F, H, J, K, P, and Q are shown with chimneys but none have linked fire places within their floor plans, although in some units this could be provided.

2.5 The dwellings have a clear rustic design and character throughout. External construction and finish materials are listed as orange multi-stock brick, orange stock brick, buttermilk colour washed render and reconstituted stone for walls, and dark heather clay plain tiles and slate colour concrete interlocking roof tiles. Some finish options include quoins to corners and / or window openings. Fenestration is white coloured finished frames of traditional proportions and black rainwater goods will be used.

2.6 The development would take vehicular access from Highworth Road to the west and would include roads, footpaths and associated parking areas, landscaping, amenity space, open space (within the gated area of the site), and the use of some open land for a swale to store water during periods of heavy and prolonged rainfall at the lowest corner of the site, north of the football ground. Pedestrian access would be available to the open space (through the gated area) and footpath / cycleway routes would be formed on the site.

2.7 Overall a total of 0.125ha (1,250sqm) of open space areas is proposed. This is short of the 0.225ha (2,250sqm) that would amount to the 15% that local plan policy H23 seeks as a 'usual' provision for a scheme of this scale. The main open space area is located within the gated area indicated on the layout plan.

2.8 In addition, it is noted that certain plots that are within the retirement housing enclave have smaller than normally provided gardens for three bedroom dwellings, (e.g. plot 9 has a 4m depth of usable rear private garden). These plots rely on the open agricultural land off-site to allow them a more extensive open space to the rear, which obviously cannot be secured should development proposals follow at some later stage on the adjoining land.

2.9 In support of the application the following documents have been submitted:

- Planning Statement (July 2012 – Barton Wilmore)

- Design and Access Statement (June 2012 – Eric Cole Architects)
- Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (June 2012 – Tyler Grange)
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Tree Protection Plan (July 2012 – Boskytrees)
- Ecological Appraisal (Nov 2011 – Malford Environmental Consulting)
- Archaeology Desk Based Assessment (February 2012 – Avon Archaeological)
- Flood Risk Assessment (July 2012 – Hydrock)
- Land Contamination Phase 1 Desk Study Report (Nov 2011 – Core Geotech)
- Transport Assessment (June 2012 – TPA)
- Affordable Housing Statement (July 2012 – Lindsey Aldington)
- Draft Framework Site Waste Management Plan (June 2012 – Blue Cedar Homes)
- Utilities Statement (June 2012 – Blue Cedar Homes)
- Statement of Community Involvement (June 2012 – Barton Willmore)

2.10 The proposal is a large major development and is contrary to the policies of the development plan. The application has been publicised as a departure on this basis.

2.11 The applicants have been in discussion with council officers and others to agree levels of contribution towards off-site services which this proposal (through the increase in population and the activities they generate) would add to the usage of, and to secure on-site facilities such as affordable housing and public open space. The required contributions cover facilities and services such as waste collection, street name plates, public art, education (primary, secondary, sixth-form and SEN), library and museums, waste management, social and healthcare, fire and rescue, highways and transport, police equipment, and local community and recreational facilities.

2.12 Extracts from the application plans are **attached** at appendix 2.

### 3.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

3.1 **Shrivenham Parish Council** – “Fully support the application. It meets the recognised housing need in the village and is well set out. It meets the parish council’s vision for future development to the north of the village”.

3.2 **Representations from local residents** – A total of six representations had been received at the time of writing this report, five objecting to the proposal, and one raising concern. The objections are made on the following grounds:

- Traffic highway safety for users of the junction onto Highworth Road
- The site is subject to flooding with inadequate drainage
- Increased pressure on local infrastructure and village amenities
- Adverse impact on the open character of the area and loss of open fields
- Additional excessive development within the village locality

The letter of concern considers the development is too close to the football ground and could impact on the activity of the football ground.

3.3 County Highways – Holding objection awaiting additional information pertaining to the transport assessment, a non-motorised user’s audit, turning areas clear of parking bays, emergency vehicle swept path details, covered secure cycle parking facilities, internal vision splays at junctions and parking areas, and incorrect TRICS data analysis methodology.

- 3.4 Landscape Architect – Objection - The proposed development is against Policy NE9 which seeks to protect the Lowland Vale from an adverse effect on the landscape, particularly on the long open views within or across the area. The proposal fails to adhere to Policy DC6 which require landscape measures designed to (i) protect and enhance the visual amenities of the site and its surroundings including, where appropriate, existing important landscape features;

The sitting of the proposed development is within the open rolling countryside on the northern boundary of Shrivenham and does not relate to existing field boundaries, features and the urban edge of the village. Existing hedgerows and associated ditches are not respected and would be largely lost as part of the development. Views of the site are available from Highworth Road to the west and also the footpath network to the east and the proposed development will alter how the northern edge of Shrivenham relates to the open countryside to the north.

In longer distance views towards Shrivenham from the public right of way network to the east, the landform restricts views of much of the village but the floodlights associated with the football ground, the mature trees of the conservation area and the houses located along the western side Highworth Road can be seen. The proposed development would bring this development east of Highworth Road into the open countryside and urbanise the northern edge of the settlement.

The implementation of hedgerow and tree planting are seen as key features of the proposed landscape mitigation to reduce the visual impact of the scheme. However there has not been enough space left within the scheme to implement the proposed planting, even with the latest revision plans.

- 3.5 Arboriculturalist – No objection, the two major trees on the site have been taken into account and the tree protection measures appear adequate.
- 3.6 Ecologist - No objection, the site has few ecological constraints.
- 3.7 Conservation and Design Officer – “The proposed boundaries to the north and east of the site are arbitrary and do not follow any recognisable features on the ground. If the site is to be developed it should be carried out as part of a comprehensive scheme including adjoining land which has better pedestrian links to the services and facilities at the centre of the village. A more comprehensive scheme would also allow infrastructure improvements to be looked at in the context of the village as a whole. The scheme is very inward looking and does not create an attractive frontage onto Highworth Road. The house styles and materials used should reflect that found locally.
- Whilst this site is not within the Shrivenham conservation area it is adjacent to it and will have an impact on its setting. The site does not integrate well with the existing village. The development of the site in the manner shown would result in piecemeal development which could sterilise the development of adjoining land.”
- 3.8 Drainage Engineer - No objection subject to inclusion of conditions for a sustainable drainage scheme, foul scheme and flood risk assessment compliance.
- 3.9 Housing Services – Satisfied with the affordable housing provision, housing mix, tenure mix, and distribution.
- 3.10 Environmental Health – No objection.

Noise – The site is adjacent to Shrivenham Football Club, however noise from matches

is likely to be limited and infrequent. The clubhouse is small and there are not any known noise problems associated with it.

Pollution - There is floodlighting to the football pitch and this will need to be taken into consideration if it is likely to impact on the development.

- 3.11 Waste Management – Require storage areas for wheeled bins per plot to be provided with collection points clear of parking areas.
- 3.12 Leisure Services – Maintenance of open space areas should be clarified and secured by adoption by parish or through a management company.

#### 4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 None

#### 5.0 POLICY & GUIDANCE

##### Vale of White Horse Local Plan

- 5.1 The local plan was adopted in July 2006. The following relevant policies have been considered to be saved by the Secretary of State's decision of 1 July 2009 whilst the Core Strategy is being produced.
- 5.2 Policy GS1 of the adopted local plan provides a general location strategy to concentrate larger-scale development within the five main settlements. Smaller-scale development in other villages is enabled by policies H11 (larger villages), H12 and H13 (small villages).
- 5.3 Policy GS2 says that outside the built up areas of settlements new building will not be permitted unless on land identified for development or the proposal is in accordance with other specific policies in the local plan.
- 5.4 Policy DC1 requires new development to be of a high design quality in terms of layout, scale, mass, height, detailing, materials to be used, and its relationship with adjoining buildings.
- 5.5 Policy DC4 requires development on sites of 0.5ha or more to contribute to public art to significantly contribute to the scheme or the area.
- 5.6 Policy DC6 requires hard and soft landscaping to protect and enhance the visual amenities of the site and surroundings and to maximise nature conservation and wildlife habitat creation.
- 5.7 Policy DC9 seeks to ensure development will not unacceptably harm the amenities of neighbouring properties and the wider environment.
- 5.8 Policy NE9 says that development in the Lowland Vale will not be permitted if it would have an adverse effect on the landscape, particularly on the long and open views within or across the area.
- 5.9 Policy NE4 covers sites of nature conservation importance and the need to protect valued wildlife habitats.
- 5.10 Policy H11 allows limited development of not more than 15 dwellings in the larger settlements (including Shrivenham) subject to design and no loss of open space.

- 5.11 Policy H13 seeks to limit new housing development outside the built-up areas of settlements.
- 5.12 Policy H16 requires about 50% provision of housing to be two-bedroom or less for schemes of more than 10 dwellings and 10% should meet lifetime homes standards.
- 5.13 Policy H17 requires 40% provision of affordable housing for schemes of more than 15 dwellings.
- 5.14 Policy H23 refers to housing schemes providing open space at 15% of the site area or, alternatively, a financial contribution if in a small village or it is inappropriate to provide open space on site.

### **Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)**

- 5.15 Residential Design Guide – adopted in December 2009  
Provides guidance on housing design and layout.
- 5.16 Sustainable Design and Construction – December 2009  
Provides advice and guidance in relation to the Code for Sustainable Homes.
- 5.17 Open Space, Sport and Recreation Future Provision – July 2008  
Provides advice for the provision and maintenance requirements for open space areas.
- 5.18 Affordable Housing – July 2006  
Provides further guidance in relation to local plan policy H17.
- 5.19 Planning and Public Art – July 2006  
Sites over 0.5 ha should provide a contribution towards public art installations in line with local plan policy DC4.

### **Other Policy Documents**

- 5.20 **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)** – March 2012  
Paragraphs 14 & 49 – presumption in favour of sustainable development  
Paragraph 34 & 37 – encourage minimised journey length to work, shopping, leisure and education  
Paragraph 47 – five year housing land supply requirement  
Paragraph 50 - create sustainable inclusive and mixed communities  
Paragraphs 57, 60 & 61 – promote local distinctiveness and integrate development into the natural, built and historic environment  
Paragraph 99 – flood risk assessment  
Paragraph 109 – contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment  
Paragraph 111 - encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has previously been developed (brownfield land)
- 5.21 **South East Plan (SEP)** – May 2009  
The SEP is still an extant policy document, although the government has made clear its intention to revoke it. The Court of Appeal has ruled that the revocation of Regional Spatial Strategies can be a material consideration in certain circumstances with the assessment of weight given to the SEP being a matter for individual decision makers. The following policies of the SEP reflect those of the local plan:  
Policy CC4 – Sustainable design and construction  
Policy CC6 – Sustainable communities and character of the environment  
Policy H3 – Affordable housing provision  
Policy H4 – Type and size of new housing units

Policy H5 – Housing design and density

6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

*Policy position*

- 6.1 Ideally, the potential development of this site, together with the surrounding open land comprising the existing field, should be considered through the local plan process given its overall size, proximity to other adjoining fields that could be considered as part of a larger strategic housing land allocation, and given the existing allocated and potential housing land allocations within the wider area. This process would ensure that the necessary combined infrastructure delivery would be sustainable, correctly planned for and managed to ensure that adverse impacts were avoided. However, the submitted planning application needs to be considered on its own site specific merits in its countryside setting.

*National advice*

- 6.2 At the heart of the new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Within the context of the NPPF, planning permission should be granted where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, unless any adverse impacts would so significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposed development when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole (para.14).
- 6.3 The current lack of a five year supply of housing land in the district is due to the lack of delivery of new housing by developers rather than an under-supply of allocated housing land. This has primarily been caused by delays in progressing some major allocations due to the economic downturn and the delay in bringing forward the council's new local plan. The current lack of a five year housing land supply requires some flexibility in line with the NPPF in the consideration of planning applications which do not accord with current local plan policy.
- 6.4 This approach, by necessity, is time limited (i.e. until the five year housing land supply has been restored) and needs to be aimed at identifying sites suitable to address the housing land shortfall whilst still meeting relevant sustainability criteria as set out in the NPPF. Specific local plan and NPPF policies for protecting the countryside and areas of landscape, biodiversity, geological, heritage and agricultural value, and those policies promoting good quality design and the provision of a mix of housing, including affordable housing, are still extant and relevant and so need to be attributed appropriate weight when deciding whether to grant planning permission. These policies are not out of date due to the lack of a five year housing land supply and, in some cases, will justify resisting a proposed development.
- 6.5 It is clear the proposed development is contrary to local plan policies GS2 and H11. However, whilst the council does not have a five year housing land supply, policies GS2 and H11 are inconsistent with the NPPF. The proposed development, therefore, needs to be considered on its site specific merits and, in particular, whether it constitutes a sustainable form of development as defined in the NPPF.

*Land Use*

- 6.6 NPPF para.111 says that planning decisions “should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has previously been developed (brownfield land).”
- 6.7 The site has been used for agricultural or similar low level uses in the past, so it cannot be claimed to represent brownfield land in this regard. The site lies within the countryside and its development for housing is contrary to local plan policies GS2 and

H11. However, as indicated above (para. 6.5) this is not a restricting factor given the current housing land shortfall. In these circumstances, other site specific matters need to be considered, in accordance with the NPPF.

*Sustainability credentials*

- 6.8 The site is in a sustainable location. It is close to the main settlement centre and to the local range of services and facilities available within the village. On the basis of the assessment of the case that has been put forward by the applicants that this proposal meets the specifications in the NPPF for providing housing in sustainable locations to address the council's current shortfall in the five year housing land supply is acknowledged.
- 6.9 However this assessment is just one consideration criteria. It should be balanced with the consideration of both the methodology for this site to come forward for consideration (referred to in para 6.1 above) given its more significant potential strategic situation, and the suitability of the location in terms of the proposed development's impact on other factors (referred to in para. 6.4 above) especially in regard to the character and landscape assessments given the site's rural fringe location within the countryside.

*Visual impact – layout, design and appearance*

- 6.10 The NPPF is explicit in seeking a high quality outcome for good design in layout and building form as a key aspect of sustainable development. The proposed layout of the housing area and the accessibility to the plots shown provides a residential arrangement offering a level of surveillance and visual linkage to the open areas and pedestrian routes indicated to be formed.
- 6.11 The proposed housing comprises houses of a traditional mix of designs. External construction and finish materials are red brick, tile hanging, smooth render, timber boarding and reconstituted coursed stone for walls and plain clay tiles, or slate on the roofs. Some finish options include contrasting brick string courses, plinths and projecting courses. Fenestration will be white timber or pvc frames of traditional proportions and rainwater goods will be black.
- 6.12 However there is a lack of useable public open space for informal play close to the houses. The attenuation basin / retention / infiltration pond is provided to offer an open area of space as opposed to the treed green to the northern portion of the site. However there are no details of the cross sections through the attenuation basin / retention / infiltration pond but the FRA states that it will be 1m deep over an area of 350m. This would likely result in steep gradients to the edges of the attenuation basin making the basin not a viable prospect for usable public open space.

*Visual impact – environmental landscape setting*

- 6.13 Paragraph 109 of the NPPF says that "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment". The site is located within the open rolling countryside on the northern boundary of Shrivenham and is relatively level but with a slight slope down towards the south-east of the site and appears to be generally unconstrained by previous uses
- 6.14 The open agricultural land to the north of Shrivenham is important to the setting of the northern edge of Shrivenham. This area has an interrelationship with the conservation area, with the trees located in the conservation area providing a visual focal backdrop to views from the north. A change in land use in this location, introducing built urban development would have a negative impact on the landscape character of the area. The proposal would be located on one of the higher elevated corners of the fields and would have a discordant appearance especially as the site boundaries do not relate to



the existing field patterns

- 6.15 The relationship with surrounding land and uses is considered to raise some questions as to long distance views from the north and east, and in respect of the proximity to and relationship with the adjoining football ground to the south-east, particularly in regard to living conditions when the ground is in use from noise and light intrusion. However, neither of the related concerns has been taken forward as being harmful in the view of relevant consultees.
- 6.16 The proposal incorporates stretches of existing hedgerows within the layout, but new external boundaries are proposed to be created. The new northern and eastern boundaries shows a hedgerow with hedgerow trees that are on or outside the redline boundary. Located within 3m of the new boundary is the centre-line of an interception ditch. This would be required to be maintained root free and therefore there would not be enough space for a substantial area of mitigation planting on the northern boundary and eastern boundary given the space provided. Preventing root incursion into the ditch through the use of root barriers would be inappropriate as it would not allow the movement of water into the interception ditch.
- 6.17 The house located at plot 18 is within 1m of the site boundary, leaving no space for any proposed mitigation screening planting. The access road to the pump house is also within 2m of the site boundary, this also does not allow enough space for the establishment of the proposed mitigation screening vegetation. The drawings do not cover any detail or principles for how the site will be landscaped. There are no details of proposed boundary landscape details or landscape proposals within the site.

*Access, parking and sustainable travel demands*

- 6.18 Vehicular access would be taken from Highworth Road. The proposal has sought to address the parking needs of the development in accordance with highway authority standards, but other information relating to parking-free turning areas, emergency vehicle swept path details, internal vision splays, refuse bin storage and cycle parking facilities are not clear or have not been provided. This has resulted in a holding objection from the local highway authority and the concerns raised have not been adequately addressed in the submitted scheme.
- 6.19 The location of the site is close to a range of existing facilities in the village and would be accessible by cycle and foot. There would be no reliance, therefore, to use the car to access the facilities available in the locality.

*Impact on neighbours' residential amenity*

- 6.20 The layout of the proposed development would not have a harmful impact on the residential amenity of adjacent houses in terms of overshadowing, light pollution, over-dominance or loss of privacy because of the lack of any directly adjoining properties.
- 6.21 Within the site the proposed layout is considered to deter crime and provide adequate levels of surveillance over public areas. Waste collection facilities (recycle bin storage and collection points) throughout the site are acceptable.

*Drainage and flooding issues*

- 6.22 The site is considered large enough to dispose of surface water without causing surface water run-off to the highway or onto neighbouring land, and the proposal seeks to deal with rare heavy surface water run-off by means of a drainage attenuation pond on the south-western side of the site, which doubles as part of the ecological and landscape feature. Drainage concerns, therefore, can be addressed.

*Affordable housing provision*

- 6.23 The applicants have now demonstrated the required number of affordable units in line with local plan H17 policy requirements. The mix of units and the tenure split is acceptable to the council's housing enabling team. The distribution of affordable units across the site has been the subject of discussion and given the small scale of the development should not be an issue.

*Social Infrastructure*

- 6.24 Concern has been expressed that current drainage infrastructure within the village would be insufficient with the increase in residents from this proposal. There has also been concern expressed that this proposal should be considered as part of a wider strategic land allocation through the local plan process.
- 6.25 Contributions to offset the impact of the proposed development have been sought, and the applicant has agreed to the principle of addressing these diverse contribution needs to be secured through a legal agreement / obligation. The policy approach, whilst justified in considering a plan led development framework has to acknowledge the submission of this scheme which needs to be considered on its own merits, especially given the current five year housing land supply shortfall within the district.

*Cumulative impact considerations*

- 6.26 This site is the second to have been subject to an application made within the Shrivenham parish area and the third within the Shrivenham ward within the last six months seeking to assist in addressing the identified housing land shortfall across the district. The other schemes have considered 31 dwellings on land between Station Road and Townsend Road which has been approved, and 120 dwellings on land south of Majors Road in Watchfield which has a resolution to approve subject to completion of a legal agreement.

**7.0 CONCLUSION**

- 7.1 The proposal does not accord with the development plan and has been publicised as a departure. In the light of the current shortfall in the council's housing land supply, the proposal's location adjoining the built-up area of the village with close availability of services and facilities needs to be afforded appropriate weight. In addition, the scheme could come on stream quickly as all the necessary criteria are in place for swift development on site which will assist in quickly addressing the current housing land shortfall.
- 7.2 The site is in a sustainable location and therefore is in broad accordance with the requirements of the national planning policy framework (NPPF). The proposal, however, would have a significant impact on the character and landscape setting of the periphery of the village, especially when long distant views are considered from the north.
- 7.3 The proposal has not provided satisfactory details to address issues relating to residential amenity or highway provision and therefore does not comply with both the local plan or with the NPPF as being an appropriate form of development.

**8.0 RECOMMENDATION**

**8.1 REFUSAL**

**The proposed residential development of 36 dwelling units is contrary to the Council's general planning policy which requires:**

**i) that so far as possible future development should in the main be concentrated in established settlements as this is considered in the best interests of the public from the point of view of economy in the provision of services of all kinds and in land use, the preservation of rural amenities and the conservation of agricultural land and because it is only in this way that balanced communities can be achieved.**

**ii) that in rural areas development is only likely to be permitted within the approved limits of development of specified villages and within the village envelope of other villages where such envelope is limited and well defined and where there is no valid planning objection.**

**iii) the site lies within a countryside area and having regard to the unsatisfactory nature of the proposal would lead to a progressive detraction in the rural character of the area and be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area, the rural landscape and to amenities of the locality.**

**iv) no overriding local need or special circumstances exist, including the present shortfall in housing land allocation provision, to warrant any departure from the planning policies of the Local Planning Authority.**

**The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies GS1, GS2, H11, H13, DC1, NE4, and NE9, of the local plan and paragraphs 14, 34, 37, 47, 49, 50, 57, 60, 61, 109, 111 and 115 of the NPPF.**

- 2. The submitted scheme has failed to provide sufficient information in relation to highway aspects of the proposal for an informative and authoritative assessment to be made and therefore the scheme is deficient in this aspect of the proposal which is necessary for a determination to be made.**
- 3. The proposed development would generate the requirement for contributions both on site for affordable housing and off-site for highway works, education, social service, leisure and arts, waste management and towards police services, which have not been entered into. Without such provision the proposal would be unacceptable. The lack of this requirement is contrary to policy DC8 of the local plan and paragraphs.**

Author / Officer: David Rothery - Major Applications Officer  
Contact number: 01235 540349  
Email address: david.rothery@southandvale.gov.uk