

BOROUGH OF KETTERING

Committee	Full Planning Committee - 28/06/2016	Item No: 5.1
Report Originator	Peter Chaplin Development Manager	Application No: KET/2015/1000
Wards Affected	Slade	
Location	Dairy Farm, Butchers Lane, Pytchley	
Proposal	Full Application: 3 no. dwellings	
Applicant	Mr D Brown John Martin And Associates,	

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- To describe the above proposals
- To identify and report on the issues arising from it
- To state a recommendation on the application

2. RECOMMENDATION

THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MANAGER RECOMMENDS that this application be REFUSED for the following reason(s):-

1. The site on ground that is noticeably higher than the adjacent Orlingbury Road, and forms the rural setting to this part of the edge of Pytchley. It is within the Pytchley Conservation Area a village that is characterised by its complex street pattern including one of which is centred on Butchers Lane.

The existing character of Butchers Lane includes scattered traditional buildings. The Dairy Farm House and its outbuilding have a strong linear form and are modestly proportioned.

The scale of development beyond the east side of Orlingbury Road is also modestly proportioned.

The overall size and bulk of the proposed dwellings would be significantly larger than the modest scale presented by existing adjacent or nearby development.

With the elevated position of this site, it is considered that the proposed built form would be incongruous and would overly dominate its surroundings, result in harm to the character and appearance of the conservation Area and the area that is part of the Conservation Area's setting.

For the reasons stated that proposal is considered contrary to the NPPF and Policy 13 of the Core Spatial strategy and the emerging JCS Policy 11

Officers Report for KET/2015/1000

The report was first intended to be reported to Committee on 8 March 2016 but on the advice of the Development Manager it was agreed that the scheme be withdrawn from that Agenda to allow for an opportunity to amend the scheme further to address what the Officer considered to be aspects of the proposals, in particular the form, bulk, height and detailed aspects of development that raised planning concerns with the officer, such concerns also reflected by objections received from the Parish Council or (in part) local residents.

As a result of further discussion changes have been made, albeit that a number of detailed aspects have not been made in accordance with the Officer advice. These changes and the issues raised are identified in the report below.

3.0 Information

Relevant Planning History

Pre application advice was sought in 2015 for a potential development of 4 dwellings but apart from an illustrative site plan, no details were provided of the proposed dwellings. In accordance with saved local plan policy RA3 restricted in fill development on part of the site was judged acceptable in principle provided a suitable proposal was compatible with other policies particularly in relation to conservation, design, density, layout, access, the need to conserve energy through good building design and the use of appropriate materials. This was likely to mean less than 4 dwellings.

Site Description

An Officer's site inspection was carried out on the 3rd February 2016 and subsequently by another officer on 02 March 2016.

The site is situated on the southern edge of the village of Pytchley, to the south of Butchers Lane and west of Orlingbury Road.

Conservation Area:

The site lies within the Pytchley conservation area. At the north side of the site in a west-east orientation is the existing Dairy Farm dwelling, a stone faced property in a rectangular form up to 6 metres width, along with subordinate single storey elements. Separated but in a similar west –east alignment is a traditional brick barn with a clay pantile roof. Elsewhere to the west of these buildings are some other traditional buildings spread out along Butchers Lane which runs along the north side of the Dairy Farm. These other buildings include 'The Cottage' which is Grade II listed, as well as farm buildings contribute to the character of the area which has a strong linear 'grain of development' both parallel to Butchers Lane and with built form at a right angle to the Lane.

The delicate balance of built form and space is an important part of what is distinctive about this part of the conservation area.

Other setting

At the front of the site is a substantial field boundary hedge which is a distinctive part of the street scene.

Beyond the east side of Orlingbury Road are earlier 20th century terraced and semidetached dwellings which are distinctive for their modest footprint, low eaves which avoids a street scene that is overly dominant.

To the east of the site is the lay-by, still adopted by the Highway Authority, that previously formed the alignment of Orlingbury Road that now sits further to the east and beyond which is existing frontage residential development that extends significantly south along Orlingbury Road beyond the application site. Immediately to the south there is a public footpath and farm track that provides access to the paddock that adjoins the site to the west and the cricket ground to the south west. The village cemetery is situated to the south of this track.

Site features

There is a gradual slope across the site from north to south. However, there is a notable change in levels from Orlingbury Road to the east of the application site with the latter sitting in a much more elevated location compared with the public road to the east side of the site. This higher ground level is an important consideration when assessing the dominance or otherwise of proposed development position.

The site is broadly rectangular in shape and is a former orchard of mature fruit trees although there are a number of other mature trees in an area otherwise laid to grass extending to approximately 0.28ha.

The boundaries of the site to the east, south and west are formed by a mix of trees and hedges.

The northern boundary is shared with Dairy Farm house, a two and a half storey stone built dwelling and some of its associated out buildings, identified above.

Proposed Development

The proposal as amended is to erect 3 detached 4 bedroom dwellings each with a detached double garage.

Since initial submission, the scheme has been revised on a number of occasions, including lowering the height of the houses and revising the siting of some of the dwellings in response to comments from the Highway Authority. However, at the time the application was withdrawn from the agenda concerns about the bulk and form were raised with the applicant and the latest amended scheme that they wish the application to be determined on is as follows:

- 3 detached dwellings now to be in approximate alignment, with single storey garaging adjacent.
- Proposed plots 1 and 3 minimum ground floor width of 7.4 metres and with a rear return resulting in the depth of the longest side elevation of approx. 11.7m
- Proposed plot 2 with a minimum ground floor width of 6.3m and with a rear return resulting in the depth of the longest side elevation of approx. 12.7m
- The proposal is to use existing ground levels so that to eaves height the proposed dwellings would be 5 metres to eaves and 8 metres to ridge. (Initially the height of largest proposed dwellings was approx. 5.3 metres to eaves and 8.4 metres to ridge)

- A single point of access adjacent to the north-east corner (instead of three individual access points which would have result in greater loss of the frontage hedge).
- A shared private drive behind the access point running parallel to boundary hedge on the east side.
- A proposed bin store collection point near the proposed access point.

The dwellings on plots 1 and 3 are the same design. The dwelling on plot 2, the middle one, having more ornate brick/stone material detailing on the front elevation. Final sample materials would be conditioned if planning permission were to be granted.

Any Constraints Affecting The Site

Conservation Area

4.0 Consultation and Customer Impact

Pytchley Parish Council

In the response received so far they stated No objection to the principle of building houses but raise objections on detailed matters, including:

- i. the houses would dominate the street scene as the site is elevated including dominating Dairy Farm and The Cottage. Suggest building bungalows or dormer bungalows or excavate the site for houses.
- ii. the houses should be built in stone to match existing properties.
- iii. as much as possible of the hedge should be retained to maintain the existing street scene.
- iv. would like to see the oak tree to be removed replanted within the village as it was grown from an acorn and should remain a feature in the village.
- v. if there is agreement for the bus shelter to be moved then the Parish Council would like to see it rebuilt in stone.

The Parish Council have been re consulted on the proposed changes and their comments will be included prior to any decision.

Natural England

Statutory nature conservation sites – no objection. Their comments have not substantially changed as a result of the proposed amendments.

Priority habitat – Submission indicates the development includes an area of priority habitat. They quote the guidance in the NPPF relating to conserving and enhancing biodiversity.

Protected Species – Have not assessed the application for impacts on associated species, should apply their standing advice.

Landscape Enhancements – This application may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably and bring benefits to the local community.

County Archaeology

The site lies within an area of probable medieval settlement and medieval and post-medieval finds are recorded nearby. Recommend a condition for an archaeological programme of works.

County Highways

Having expressed no objection to an earlier amended scheme, the Highway Authority has raised an objection about parking provision. They add: plan 15023 revision G does not (allow for more than two marked spaces per plot. 'This would be acceptable were the dwellings 3 bedrooms or fewer. "NCC requires 3 parking spaces for dwellings with four bedrooms irrespective of garages. Drawing SK01 revision G shows acceptable pedestrian and vehicle visibility splays, access widths, hard bound surfacing although it is shown as permeable" The Local Highway Authority (LHA) does not allow soakaways within 5 metres of the highway boundary ie not on the highway verge"

Should the LPA seek to approve the application they seek to approve the application they ask for a number of conditions relating to their standards eh visibility splays. Garage set back distances etc.

Environmental Health

No objection to the application subject to a condition addressing contamination and an informative regarding the presence of radon.

Wildlife Trust

Have considered the submitted Phase 1 Habitat and Protected Species Survey find the overall scope and content to be both acceptable and satisfactory in broad and general terms. As a consequence of the report's findings a set of suitable conditions should be attached to any planning permission relating to the delivery of certain specific measures set out in the Survey report.

Neighbours:

In response to earlier plans the neighbours expressed the following:

15 Orlingbury Road – Object. Loss of privacy as application site is at a higher ground level overlooking our property. Would lead to an increase in traffic which can also be a problem on this stretch of road. Established flora and fauna provide a much needed habitat for wildlife as well as being part of Pytchley's rural setting. Existing homes are not crammed in or overlooking which is a major part of the village's appeal. Proposal is of no benefit to the village or its residents. Expensive commuter housing seems to be just profit making for an individual who does not live in the village. The existing house and gardens are a beautiful central part of the village and represent days gone by and preserve typical village life. Should not be ruined by shoehorning 3 houses into its garden.

13 Orlingbury Road – Object. New houses will dominate all nearby buildings. Will overlook our home and appear imposing as we are the nearest. No reference to materials with the application therefore can't assess the aesthetic impact on the surrounding area or neighbours. Design of the houses does not appear to be in keeping with the surrounding area i.e. dormer style homes. Application should be refused because of the domineering nature of the development. How much consideration will be given to existing home owners. Have taken photos out of all windows that will be affected. Will have to keep all curtains and blinds shut on the west side of the property.

11 Orlingbury Road – Object. As the land is approximately 9 feet higher the height of the properties will be extremely dominating and visually overbearing to residents. Houses are an inappropriate design and will be totally out of keeping with neighbouring properties that are mainly dormer style and cottages. Orlingbury Road only has housing on one side of the road apart from Dairy Farm. Infilling as proposed could ruin the character of the village as the designs are out of keeping with existing properties. Materials are not specified, the proposed buildings should match the rest of the buildings within the conservation area. The application should be refused and a further application be made for dormer bungalows that would be less intrusive on neighbouring properties and more sensitive to the character of the village and surrounding properties.

3 Isham Road – Object. The site is outside the Council's own agreed development and comes under previously considered sites RA175 and RA176 both of which were discounted. I am a parish councillor but missed the last parish council meeting and would have objected to the proposal for the same reasons the Council gave in their assessment of the area.

Any further comments received within the time given for re-consultation will be considered prior to any decision being made

5.0 Planning Policy

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires any harm to the significance of designated heritage assets (in this case the Pytchley Conservation Area) to be weighed against any benefits accrued.

In determining applications, LPAs should:

Para 128.....require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made to their setting. The level of detail proportionate to the asset's importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance

Para 131.....take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic viability; and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness

Para 138: the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area;

Core Planning Principles

Part 6 Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes

Part 7 Requiring good design

Part 11 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Part 12 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Development Plan Policies

North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy (CSS)

Policy 1 Strengthening the Network of Settlements

Policy 7 Delivering Housing

Policy 9 Distribution of Housing

Policy 13 General Sustainable Development Principles

Policy 14 Energy Efficiency and Sustainable Construction

North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS) 2011-2013

The report of the Inspector who examined the proposed main modifications to the Submitted Plan is imminent with the expected adoption of the JCS in the near future.

Policy 11 Network of Urban and Rural Areas

Policy 29 Distribution of New Homes.

Saved Local Plan (LP)

Policy RA3 Rural Area: Restricted Infill Villages

6.0 Financial/Resource Implications

None.

7.0 Planning Considerations

The key issues for consideration in this application are

1. Principle of Development
2. Impact on the Conservation Area including the Design, Character and Appearance
3. Other Heritage Assets
4. Impact on Residential Amenity
5. Highways
6. Bio-diversity
7. Sustainability
8. Archaeology

1. Principle of Development

Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires local planning authorities to determine planning applications in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Pytchley sits within the open countryside where normally development, including residential, is resisted unless policy provision makes allowance for such development.

Policy 1 of the 2008 CSS focuses new development on the three Growth Towns of Corby, Kettering and Wellingborough. In rural areas it directs development to sites within the village boundaries. Policy 9 in part strictly controls new development in the open countryside. Policy 10 seeks to limit development in villages.

Pytchley as a rural settlement is expected to provide the smallest amount of growth within the settlement hierarchy where the level of development should be determined by local housing need. Therefore residential development of this scale would contribute, although not significantly, towards the target level growth for the rural area, which is set at 1640 for the plan period in Policy 10 of the CSS.

However in the review of the CSS, the emerging JCS has decreased this target through an update on previous figures in Policy 29, where the rural housing target is 480. This Plan (JCS) has been through examination as explained above and the relevant policies contained within the document can be given due weight in accordance with paragraph 216 of the NPPF.

Policy RA3 of the LP defines the village boundary for Pytchley within which the application site is located. This policy states that in restricted infill villages, housing development should meet 5 criteria.

Firstly the application site is within the defined village limit, which it is in this case.

Secondly a proposal is to be appropriate in terms of size, form, character and setting of the village and in terms of the local community and environment. This is discussed below.

Thirdly, the proposal does not involve the development of open land shown on the Proposals map, the land is not designated as such.

Fourthly a proposal is to be compatible with other policies and proposals in the Plan, particularly in relation to conservation, design, density, the site layout, access, drainage, landscaping and open space provision. Again this is discussed below although Policy 13 of the CSS has superseded the majority of these considerations.

Finally a proposal should take account of the need to conserve energy through good building design and the use of appropriate materials. This is discussed below although Policy 14 of the CSS has superseded these considerations.

Emerging policy

Having regard to the third party objection referring to sites 'RA175 and RA176' these are sites referred to in the Council's emerging Site Specific Proposals Local Development Document Housing Allocations Assessment of Additional Sites and Update 2013 which related to the application site forming part of a significantly wider site.

The process of allocating new housing sites in the emerging Site Specific Local Development Document remains at an early stage and can be afforded minimal weight. The Settlement Boundary Update (September 2015) recommended that the application site is removed from the settlement. However, as this document is yet to be adopted this element also carries minimal weight.

Having regard to the above, subject to detailed considerations discussed below, the principle for a limited infill on this site is considered acceptable.

2. The Impact on the Conservation Area and Design, Character and Appearance

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 places a duty on all local planning authorities to have to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires any harm to the significance of designated heritage assets (in this case the Pytchley Conservation Area) to be weighed against any benefits accrued.

Part 7 of the NPPF requires good design. Policy 13 (h and i) of the CSS states development should be of a high standard of design and respect and enhance the character of its surroundings and create a strong sense of place.

As stated above the site also lies within the Pytchley Conservation Area designated in 1984. The 1984 document sets out that the village is characterised by its complex street pattern and that there a number of distinct parts to the village one of which is centred on Butchers Lane.

The context of the proposal is described in the site description and other text above. It will sit front Orthingbury Road and extend built development to the south on the western side on currently undeveloped land. Orthingbury Road has been extended on the east side by a later 20th century development compared to the much older historic core of the village.

A potentially sensitive part of the proposal is the loss of the open space which currently takes the form of a former orchard associated with the Dairy Farm house. In conservation area terms though the loss of this open space is not identified as a protected space. It is therefore, not an overriding constraint subject to an acceptable built form.

As stated above the site sits within the village limit boundary and the issue is whether a proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the conservation area or the street scene and whether there are any material consideration to outweigh any harmful affect.

The nearest dwelling to the application site is the existing Dairy Farm house. This is a two storey stone built property with a tiled pitched roof over with windows on the rear elevation of a 'modern' design. Alongside this is an existing brick outbuilding. The easterly single storey element to the Dairy Farm dwelling is clearly subordinate to the principal part of the dwelling. The 6 metre width of the linear form compared with the dimensions of the proposed dwellings as described above is an example of the generally modest scale of existing development in the immediate area.

It is recognised that the applicant has responded to a request to amend the initial proposals and has reduced the sizes, and lowered eaves level. The ridge level of the rear part of proposed Plot 2 has been lowered by approx. 0.5m though with eaves level of the rear projection level with the rest of the building.

Some other changes to design detailing has also been made. Furthermore, the single point of access now proposed at the north east end of the frontage hedge would minimise the impact of the loss of parts of the hedge, though if approved it would in practice be difficult to control the degree to which this hedge can be retained.

Despite these changes, the overall footprint and size of the proposed dwellings would be significantly larger than that of the nearest properties. With the elevated position of this site, the proposed built form would dominate the surroundings and especially contrast with the modest scale presented by existing development.

Detailing in terms of materials relating to the external appearance and features could be conditioned to satisfy a requirement for traditional or natural materials in a conservation area. However, the principal concern has not been overcome.

The proposed garages have been arranged in a way that helps to indicate a linear form and subject to materials the design is acceptable with the exception that garage door opening widths at just over 2metres make it difficult for a vehicle to easily get through the opening (between the wing mirrors the width of the illustrative car in the proposed garage measures 2.3m)

In conclusion, the proposed built form would be visible from the public realm. The proposed bulk and form of the proposed dwellings is judged to adversely affect the character and appearance of the conservation area.

3. Other Heritage assets

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 places a duty on all Local Planning Authorities to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses in considering whether or not to grant planning permission.

The nearest listed building to the site is The Cottage in Butchers Lane which is Grade II listed. However this is some distance to the rear of the site; the setting of the listed building is not directly adjoining the proposed development.

The specific impact of the proposed development is as part of the character or appearance of the conservation area as assessed earlier.

4. Impact on Residential Amenity

Policy 13(l) of the CSS looks to secure development that does not result in an unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties or the wider area.

The nearest dwelling to the proposed development is Dairy Farm house that sits to the north of the application site with its rear (south facing) elevation facing towards proposed plot 3. Its rear garden depth up to the boundary of plot 3 is at least 10m. The distance between Dairy Farm house and the rear of the proposed dwelling is around 20 metres. Adjacent to the boundary is a proposed double garage with the side elevation around 12 metres from the existing dwelling. The side elevation of the main proposed built form of Plot 3 is approximately 19.5metres away.

This relationship is considered acceptable giving rise to no undue amenity uses for either the occupiers of Dairy Farm house or the future occupiers of the proposed dwelling on plot 3.

The next nearest properties on the opposite side of Orlingbury Road are 9, 11, 13 and 15 Orlingbury Road, two pairs of semi-detached dwellings. Nos. 9 and 11 sit at an oblique angle to the application site looking directly towards the access to Dairy Farm house itself as opposed to the application site. No. 13 faces towards what is proposed plot 1 with no.15 facing more towards the southern boundary of the site that is the southern boundary of plot 3.

The application site is notably higher than land to the east as indicated previously. However the proposed dwellings would be a distance of around 37m from the front elevations of nos. 13 and 15 Orlingbury Road. This distance is considered acceptable and will not result in any undue overlooking between the properties, added to which they are separated by Orlingbury Road itself which is the subject of both vehicle and pedestrian movements.

The objections from the two neighbouring properties have been noted but for the above reasons there is considered to be no unacceptable loss of privacy for these occupiers.

The relationship between the proposed dwellings themselves, having regard to their orientation and location, is also considered acceptable in regard to residential amenity of existing properties not resulting in any adverse impact on the amenity of occupiers.

In this regard therefore, the proposed development is therefore considered compliant with Policy 13 of the CSS.

5. Highways

Policy 13d) and n) of CSS requires proposed development to have a satisfactory means of access and provide for parking, servicing and manoeuvring in accordance with adopted standards and not have any adverse impact on the highway network and will not prejudice highway safety.

The Highway Authority concern over parking provision is linked to the building size which in an earlier scheme (Revision D) each plot could accommodate more than two marked parking spaces per plot.

However, it was important for the development if approved to be subject of further discussion because of the consideration to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation Area. Although it has not been possible to come to a solution that Officers can support the shared private drive and single access point is regarded as an improvement.

Whilst the Highway Authority suggests a number of conditions, their concern about the number of parking spaces could be addressed.

The existing bus shelter is not proposed to be relocated following the most recent revision.

6. Bio-diversity

Policy 13 o) of the CSS seeks to conserve and enhance in part the biodiversity of the environment which reflects the guidance in paragraph 118 of the NPPF.

A Phase 1 Habitat and Protected Species Survey has been submitted with the application. The Survey concludes that:

- i. The application site interior contains a low diversity of habitats, dominated by species poor amenity grassland and scattered trees (fruit orchard). The site is bounded by hedging, trees and tall rural vegetation. The plant communities within these habitats are ecologically unremarkable. They are widespread and abundant, containing a relatively low diversity of common species typical of nutrient enriched amenity and improved grassland with widespread perennial and ephemeral weed species.
- ii. The marginal habitats are of greater ecological value and in particular the boundary hedgerows and trees which have a value to nesting birds, bats and refuge and food source for small mammals and insects. The majority of the construction area is mown amenity grassland with fruit trees. The fruit trees and other scattered trees across the site interior have some wildlife interest but are of limited value in purely arboriculture terms. Subject to the more valuable boundary trees and hedges being retained, enhanced and suitably protected the proposal is unlikely to have a detrimental impact on the ecological interests and wider landscape subject to mitigation.
- iii. The results of the survey indicated that certain protected species are considered as likely to occur on the wider site. The trees and hedges along the site margins and across the south end of the site are likely used by nesting birds and foraging and commuting bats and the mature ash tree along the western boundary contains some features such as cracks, rot holes and flaking bark which could be used as bat roosts, especially during the summer.
- iv. A Construction Ecological Management Plan has been recommended to adopt best working practices to minimise disturbance to the above species and to maintain and enhance the valuable ecological receptors where possible.
- v. Specific recommendations are made in relation to birds and the nesting season, bats and their potential roosting areas and herpetofauna (reptiles) and the need to survey the site before any works commence.

It is evident from the Survey's results that the existing biodiversity of the site is concentrated in the boundary hedges and some of the none orchard trees and that as much of these should be retained and enhanced wherever possible if planning permission is granted. The proposal only interferes with the existing boundary hedging on the eastern boundary where three openings are to be created to provide vehicle access to each dwelling. In terms of the removal of trees the more significant close to the southern boundary and western boundary at the southern end of the site are to be retained.

It is considered in these circumstances and having regard to the fact the Wildlife Trust are supportive of the Survey's results and recommendations subject to conditions safeguarding the possible presence of birds, bats and reptiles, along with enhancing the biodiversity of the site to meet the guidance in the NPPF highlighted by Natural England, the proposal is in accordance with Policy 13 of the CSS.

The proposed retention of most of the existing front hedgerow save for where it needs to be broken to provide a vehicular access is welcome though as stated earlier, if permission is granted retention of the hedge could be difficult to secure.

Some of the existing trees will be retained, especially the important group close to the southern boundary to the site where, along with the existing hedgerow, which can be retained intact, is considered particularly important as this part of the site is visible first when approaching the village and the conservation area from the south.

In recognition that the site includes a former orchard the applicant's representative has confirmed that the area of land south of the house is classed as a Traditional Orchard (UK BAP Priority Habitat). The agent adds:

"This is a spatial dataset that describes the geographic extent and location of Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006) Section 41 habitats of principal importance.

This area is listed as a general priority habitat and does not refer specifically to any protected tree or plant species. Whilst it is acknowledged that a number of mature apple and other fruit trees are to be removed along with sections of hedging to facilitate the houses and access way it is proposed that replacement planting within the gardens or other area of the site would form part of the development within landscaping details, including the potential for additional hedges to be created between the dwellings to off-set the loss of the roadside hedge sections."

It would be possible to address through conditions areas of ecology that may require further action such as in regard to the trees or orchard.

7. Sustainability

Policy 14 of the CSS requires that for a development of this scale it should incorporate techniques of sustainable construction and energy efficiency, the provision of waste reduction and recycling and provision for water efficiency and water recycling.

A sustainability appraisal and energy statement has been submitted with the application. This has been considered and found acceptable for a development of this scale.

Subject to a condition being attached to any planning permission requiring compliance with the provisions set out in the statement it is considered the development would be in accordance with the Policy 14 of the CSS.

8. Archaeology

Policy 13 o) of the CSS seeks in part to conserve and enhance designated built environmental assets and their setting which reflects the guidance in paragraphs 128 and 129 of the NPPF regarding safeguarding heritage assets.

A desk based assessment of the site has been submitted. County Archaeology have been consulted on this and in response have noted the site lies within an area of probable medieval settlement though there are no areas of identified earth works relating to the medieval village in the immediate vicinity, however medieval and post medieval finds are recorded nearby. There is the potential of archaeological interest to survive on the site

albeit truncated by more recent activity. In response to this they therefore recommend a condition be attached to any permission requiring an archaeological programme of works.

It is considered that in this regard the proposal is in accordance with Policy 13 of the CSS subject to the attachment of this condition.

Conclusion

The principle of suitable infill development is acceptable. However, due to the bulk, and size of the proposed dwellings the proposal would overly dominate its setting and fail to enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

For this reason the application is recommended for refusal.

Background Papers

Title of Document:

Date:

Contact Officer:

Peter Chaplin, Development Manager on 01536 534316

Previous Reports/Minutes

Ref:

Date: