

Case No: 19/00253/PIP (PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE)

Proposal: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT FOR UP TO TWO DWELLINGS

Location: LAND WEST OF BARLEY CROFT BACK LANE HOLYWELL

Applicant:

Grid Ref: 533930 270838

Date of Registration: 07.02.2019

Parish: HOLYWELL-CUM-NEEDINGWORTH

RECOMMENDATION - APPROVE

This application is referred to the Development Management Committee (DMC) in accordance with the current Scheme of Delegation as:

1. The Permission in Principle Application (PIP) is a departure from the development plan and is recommended for approval. Huntingdonshire District Council's Scheme of Delegation states that final decisions on all applications for Permission in Principle can be delegated to Officers unless the proposal is contrary to the development plan and recommended for approval.

1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND APPLICATION

1.1 The application site is located on vacant agricultural land west of the dwelling known as Barley Croft, Back Lane, Holywell. The site is considered to be located outside the built up area of Holywell-cum-Needingworth with countryside to the North and West of the site. The land is within flood zone 1, at low risk of flooding and is adjacent to and outside the village conservation area which extends further to the east, south east and south of the site.

1.2 The application is for a PIP for up to two dwellings. The description has been amended as part of the determination process to clarify development is up to a maximum of two dwellings. The first part of a PIP application only assesses the principle issues namely location, use and amount of development, and an assessment has to be made under the above principle issues only, having regard to the development plan and all other material planning considerations, to establish whether the site is suitable in principle for up to two dwellings.

2. NATIONAL GUIDANCE

2.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2019) sets out the three economic, social and environmental objectives of the planning system to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. The NPPF confirms that 'So sustainable development is pursued in a positive way, at the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour

of sustainable development. The NPPF sets out the Government's planning policies for:

- * delivering a sufficient supply of homes;
- * achieving well-designed places;
- * conserving and enhancing the natural environment;
- * conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

2.2 Whilst the NPPF 2019 has now been published and replaces the NPPF 2012, transitional arrangements are in place for authorities who have submitted Local Plans submissions prior to the 29 January 2019 and to ensure consistency, the 2012 framework policies will continue to be relevant. For clarity HDC submitted their Local Plan on 29 March 2018.

2.3 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2012) sets out the three dimensions to sustainable development - an economic role, a social role and an environmental role - and outlines the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Under the heading of Delivering Sustainable Development, the Framework sets out the Government's planning policies for:

- * promoting sustainable transport;
- * delivering a wide choice of high quality homes;
- * requiring good design;
- * conserving and enhancing the natural environment;
- * conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

2.4 In this report, reference to both NPPF 2012 and 2019 from here-on referred to as 'the NPPF'

2.5 Planning Practice Guidance

For full details visit the government website

<https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-communities-and-local-government>

3. PLANNING POLICIES

3.1 Saved policies from the Huntingdonshire Local Plan (1995)

- H20: Infill Housing
- H23: Housing Outside of Environmental Limits
- H31: Residential Privacy and amenity standards
- T18: Access requirements for new development
- T19: Pedestrian Routes and Footpath
- T20: Cycle Routes
- En2: "Character and setting of Listed Buildings"
- En5: "Conservation Area Character"
- En6: "Design standards in Conservation Areas"
- En9; "Conservation Areas"
- En17: Development in Countryside
- En18: Protection of countryside features
- En19: Trees and Landscape
- En20: Landscaping Scheme
- En22: Nature and Wildlife Conservation
- EN25: General Design
- CS8: Water
- CS9: Flood Water Management

- 3.2 Saved policies from the Huntingdonshire Local Plan Alterations (2002)
- HL5: "Quality and density of development"
- 3.3 Adopted Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2009)
- CS1: Sustainable development in Huntingdonshire
 - CS2: Strategic Housing Development
 - CS3: The Settlement Hierarchy
 - CS10: Contributions to Infrastructure requirements
- 3.4 Huntingdonshire's Local Plan to 2036: Proposed Submission 2017
- LP1: Amount of Development
 - LP2: Strategy for Development
 - LP4: Contributing to Infrastructure Delivery
 - LP5: Flood Risk
 - LP6: Waste Water Management
 - LP8: Key Service Centres
 - LP10: Small Settlements
 - LP11: The Countryside
 - LP12: Design Context
 - LP13: Design Implementation
 - LP15: Amenity
 - LP16: Surface Water
 - LP17: Sustainable Travel
 - LP18: Parking Provision and vehicle movement
 - LP32: Biodiversity and Geodiversity
 - LP33: Trees, Woodland, Hedges and Hedgerow
 - LP36: Heritage Assets and their Settings
- 3.5 The LPA consider the Local Plan to 2036 to be a sound plan and it was submitted for examination on the 29th March 2018. Footnote 22 of NPPF 2019 states during the transitional period for emerging plans submitted for examination (set out in paragraph 214 of NPPF 2019), consistency should be tested against the previous Framework published in March 2012. The plan has therefore reached an advanced stage and is consistent with the policies set out within the NPPF 2012.
- 3.6 The Local Plan examination hearings ended on 27 September 2018 and the Inspector's initial findings are that the plan can be made sound by main modifications.
- 3.7 Following the examination hearings held in July and September 2018, the wording of LP2, LP5 and LP11 are to be changed. For LP2 "recognise" is to be added in relation to the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, LP3 adds text above the Grafham Water heading, LP5 is to be amended as agreed with the Environment Agency and County Council, and LP11 the word "protect" is to be replaced with "recognise". The Inspector has not required any main modifications to any of the other policies listed above that would have any material implications for this application.
- 3.8 The emerging Local Plan has now reached an advanced stage and in the light of the Inspector's initial findings should be afforded more

weight. Save for policies LP2, LP5 and LP11, it is considered that significant (but not full) weight should now be afforded to the policies referred to within the Local Plan to 2036 (as amended March 2018 for submission). The Local Planning Authority has agreed to the required changes to LP2, LP5 and LP11 but as the required changes to Policies LP2, LP5 and LP11 have recently been subject to further consultation before adoption, it is considered that moderate rather than significant weight should be afforded to these policies as modified.

- 3.9 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) and Guidance:
- Huntingdonshire Design Guide SPD (2017)
 - Huntingdonshire Townscape and Landscape Assessment SPD 2007
 - Developer Contributions SPD 2011
 - Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD 2017
 - Huntingdonshire Tree Guidance Note 3
 - December 2017 Annual Monitoring Review regarding housing land supply.

Weight of Development Plan Policies & NPPF Consistency:

- 3.10 The fact that the Development Plan policies are old is in itself irrelevant as they remain saved policies and the statutory starting point is S.38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (PCPA) 2004 and the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (section 70(2)) which require that, in dealing with planning applications, the Local Planning Authority shall have regard to the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations.
- 3.11 As a material consideration carrying significant weight, the NPPF advises at paragraph 213 that due weight should be given to relevant Development Plan policies according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF so the closer

Local policies are viewable at <https://www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk>

4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 No relevant history

5. CONSULTATIONS

- 5.1 **Needingworth Parish Council** – No objections – comments summarised below:
- * No material planning reasons on which to object to this application, however the Parish Council have the following comments
 - * The total number of developments the Parish has had approved recently all compounding infrastructure issues.
 - * The need for access/egress of the site to be on Back Lane.
 - * The need to improve the footpath along Back Lane that the entrance will cross.
 - * That no house should be built directly on the corner of Mill Way and Back Lane as this will obstruct visibility on a dangerous corner.

* Under the Town & Country planning (permission in principle)(amendment) order 2017 that a 14 day notice of development should have been posted near the site. We do not believe this has been displayed.

5.2 **Conservation Officer** – On balance no objections, comments summarised within the report below

6. REPRESENTATIONS

6.1 4 objections to the application have been received which are summarised below:

* The development will have a negative effect on the open countryside.

* Wildlife activity has been observed including foxes, badgers, deer and owls. The building of three houses will displace wildlife

* Holywell is a conservation area, the Character Statement December 1994, section En8 was mentioned; the proposed development will be right at the only entry to the village, and will clearly impact and impair the views into and out of the conservation area as well as impacting a significant open space and rural setting

* Noise and disruption from construction would be significant.

* Little information about the proposed development

* Holywell is a ring village, development should be on brownfield sites in the district not Greenfield sites around the village

* Developers building for profit.

* Public site notice amended to 14 days

* The proposed land is at the moment agricultural land used for grazing cattle and sheep, change of use is not justifiable

* Highway safety - The proposed land is on a dangerous blind corner on a narrow road, where cars can only just pass each other with care and lorries take up the whole of the road, this corner is also the only entry and exit to the village.

* Would impact the pedestrian footpath and cyclists.

* Access issues generally needs to be established for any development seeking access along Church Street/Mill Lane up to the junction with Needingworth High Street

* Development would be a departure from the development plan, no overriding considerations

* Precedent for refusal elsewhere in the district using refs 17/00892/OUT for visual impact on the character of the area and 16/01468/OUT for non-essential development and adverse impact on the conservation area

* Infrastructure and utilities needs confirmation

7. ASSESSMENT

7.1 The report addresses the principal, important and controversial issues which are in this case:

- Principle of development and sustainability
- Impact on the countryside and rural character of the area
- Impact on the Heritage Assets
- Residential Amenity
- Highways safety and parking
- Drainage
- Ecology
- Other Matters

Principle of the Development

- 7.2 The site is considered to be located outside of, but adjacent to the Small Settlement of Holywell, and within the open countryside as classified in Policy CS3 of the Core Strategy 2009. Policy CS3 of the Core Strategy sets out that for Smaller Settlements "residential infilling will be appropriate within the built-up area"; with 'residential infilling' indicated as being up to 3 dwellings within the built-up area. The policy also provides that development proposals of a larger scale may be allowed where specific circumstances demonstrate that this secures the most sustainable option for the site. However Policy LP11 of the Local Plan to 2036 Proposed Submission 2017 states that development within the countryside will be restricted to the limited and sporadic opportunities as provided for in other policies of the plan. Amongst other requirements, development must protect the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and not give rise to noise, odour, obtrusive light or other impacts that would adversely affect the use and enjoyment of the countryside by others.
- 7.3 Emerging policy LP10 (Small Settlements) is also relevant and states that "A proposal for development on land well-related to the built-up area may be supported where it accords with the specific opportunities allowed for through other policies of this plan". Paragraph 4.111 of the supporting text of LP10 identifies that "Proposals for development outside of built-up areas will be considered subject to the provisions of policies 'The Countryside', 'Rural Economy', 'Local Services and Community Facilities', 'Tourism and Recreation', 'Community Planning Proposals', 'Rural Exceptions Housing', 'Rural Buildings' and 'Water Related Development'". The proposed development does conflict with emerging policy LP10 as the proposed development is not identified as a 'specific opportunity' which other emerging policies allow for under emerging policy LP10.
- 7.4 Following on from this, the extents of the settlements' built-up areas are not defined on maps, but are to be judged on a site-by-site basis. Paragraph 5.15 of the Core Strategy's explanatory text states that the built-up area should be considered to be the 'existing built form', but excluding: (i) buildings that are detached from the settlement; (ii) gardens and undeveloped curtilage land at the settlement edge, where these are more related to the countryside than the village; and (iii) agricultural buildings. It is considered that the development would not be 'isolated' (referred to in para 79 of the NPPF) as there are established houses to the east, south east and south of the site. However the proposed dwellings do not meet any of the exception criteria set out in the local policies regarding development in the countryside such as an agricultural need or exceptional design quality, and as the site is located within the countryside, new dwellings would normally be resisted – the proposal is therefore a departure from both the Development Plan and relevant emerging Local Plan policies mentioned above.
- 7.5 Turning to the housing supply position, in order to satisfy the requirements of the NPPF to boost housing supply the Council must demonstrate an up-to-date five year supply of deliverable housing sites to meet its objectively assessed need, with an additional buffer to ensure choice and competition in the market for land; this requirement is set out in paragraph 11 of the NPPF. Due to under

delivery in recent years the buffer to be applied for the District is 20%. The December 2017 Annual Monitoring Review applies the 20% buffer and demonstrates that the Council has a five year supply of housing land.

- 7.6 The Development Plan policies relevant to the supply of housing (En17 and H23 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan (HLP) and CS2 and CS3 of the Huntingdonshire Core Strategy (HCS)) were set against a lower Objectively Assessed Need figure such that strict application of these policies would result in failure to achieve the objectively assessed housing need figure that the Council currently has identified as part of the emerging Local Plan to 2036.
- 7.7 These policies are therefore no longer fully up-to-date or consistent with the NPPF and, at this time and until the Council adopts the Local Plan to 2036 with up-to-date policies, the 'tilted balance' as set out within d ii of para. 11 is engaged. For decision-taking this means granting permission in instances where there are no relevant Development Plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, unless any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits (having regard to the Framework policies taken as a whole), or specific policies of the Framework indicate development should be restricted. Footnote 6 to the Framework provides some examples of these restrictive policies. Therefore given the housing supply policy position above, two new dwellings within the countryside could be accepted subject to other considerations.
- 7.8 This application is made pursuant to the Town and Country Planning (Permission in Principle) Order 2017 (as amended) (PIP regulations) that provides opportunity for an applicant to apply as to whether permission in principle is acceptable for a site, having regard to specific legislative requirements and, in accordance with ref. 58-012-20180615 of the NPPG, as to whether the location, land use and amount of development proposed is acceptable. The PIP consent route is an alternative way of obtaining planning permission for housing-led development which separates the consideration of matters of principle for proposed development from the technical detail of the development. The permission in principle consent route has 2 stages: the first stage (or permission in principle stage) establishes whether a site is suitable in-principle and the second ('technical details consent') stage is when the detailed development proposals are assessed. PIP establishes that a particular scale of housing-led development on a defined site is acceptable. The aim is for a PIP to minimize the upfront and at-risk work of applicants.
- 7.9 A PIP must be activated by a successful Technical Details Consent (TDC) application. Both PIP and TDC decisions should follow development plan policies and the NPPF. It is clear from the guidance that a PIP does not have the elevated status of planning permission; this status is reserved for the TDC application. However, the guidance states that a TDC "must be decided in accordance with the terms of the permission in principle granted for the site". Whilst the Council would have a level of control over the Technical Details stage and would have the power to refuse such an application, the LPA is tied to the decision of the PIP regardless of the harm it might cause to the countryside.

Sustainability

- 7.10 The presumption in favour of sustainable development requires proposals to achieve economic, social and environmental gains; as such a balancing exercise has to be undertaken to weigh the benefits of the scheme against its disadvantages.

Environmental Sustainability

- 7.11 In relation to the loss of higher grade of agricultural land, Policy LP11 of the Huntingdonshire District Council Local Plan to 2036: Proposed Submission 2017 states that the Council will only grant planning permission where development seeks to use land of lower agricultural value in preference to land of higher agricultural value, avoid the irreversible loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grade 1 to 3a) where possible, and avoiding Grade 1 agricultural land unless there are exceptional circumstances where the benefits of the proposal significantly outweigh the loss of land. Development should protect the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside; and not give rise to noise, odour, obtrusive light or other impacts that would adversely affect the use and enjoyment of the countryside by others. In this case, the site is classified as a mixture of grade II and III agricultural land. Due to the Council's out of date housing supply policies, at this time weight can be given to the need for housing as overriding the need to retain this small parcel of unused agricultural land when conducting the planning balance. As this is only a small parcel the proposal is not considered to result in a significant loss of high value agricultural land.

Economic sustainability:

- 7.12 The provision of up to 2 new dwellings would give rise to employment during the construction phase of the development, and has the potential to result in an increase in the use of local services and facilities, both of which will be of benefit to the local economy.

Social sustainability:

- 7.13 Given that this proposal is required to meet all three elements of the definition of sustainability as set out in the NPPF, there is a need to consider the range facilities in Holywell available to the potential future occupants of the proposed scheme and the impact of the scheme on the capacity of public services that serve the village and the nearby settlement of Needingworth. Holywell itself as a village is supplied by a limited amount of local services which include a public house, and a church.
- 7.14 The Institute of Highways and Transportation (IHT) provide guidance on desirable walk distances in their publication 'Providing for Journeys on Foot' which recommends suggested acceptable walking distances of between 500m (6 minutes, "Desirable") and 2km (25 minutes, "Preferred Maximum") for commuting and journeys to school. For non-commuter journeys the guidance suggests that a walk distance of up to 1,200 metres can be 'considered', with the 'acceptable' and 'desirable' distances being 800 and 400 metres respectively. Similarly, acceptable cycling distances vary between individuals and circumstances but trips up to 5km (3.1miles) are

accepted as having the potential to substitute car trips. However, these are not framed as absolute requirements: the SPD states that 'ideally' new homes will be built to be within those distances and the IHT guidance acknowledges that acceptable walking and cycling distances will vary between individuals.

- 7.15 Needingworth is near to the village of Holywell and has more facilities than many of the villages identified as a 'Small Settlement'. Given the proximity of Holywell and Needingworth, it is considered that occupiers would have a reasonable level of access to services and facilities within the village; either on foot or by cycle. Needingworth possesses a number of amenities which include a post office and shop, village hall, recreation ground, public house, primary school and a church.
- 7.16 Holywell is also well located in regards to the level of services and amenities and within the nearby market town of St Ives. As outlined within the IHT's guidance, it is recognised that many people will cycle to services/amenities outside of the 25-minute walk distance, but which are located within 5 kilometres (approximately a 15-minute cycle time). St Ives Market Town falls within this radius, hosting a range of retail outlets, banks, hair dressers, pubs, coffee shops, schools, nurseries, GP surgeries, dental practices and fast-food outlets. It is therefore considered that the amount and location of the proposed development is sustainable when having regard to the level of service and infrastructure provision within Holywell and Needingworth, and when taking account of the opportunities to access everyday services and facilities by sustainable modes of travel (including walking, cycling and public transport) within the nearby Market Town of St Ives.

Other Matters

Impact on the countryside and rural character of the area

- 7.17 The site is considered to be located outside the built up area of Holywell with countryside to the North and West of the site. However existing development is to the south and East. Concerns have been raised via the representations about concerns about the countryside impact. Whilst it is accepted there is a rural nature to the site on the entrance to the village, the site is restricted from the open countryside to the West by the Public Highway as well as being screened by existing trees and hedgerows. The site does not extend into the open countryside to the North any more than the existing residential development to the East. Whilst it is accepted that development on this site would alter the rural character of the area, it could also be argued the site is reasonably well related to the existing development in the village of Holywell. The proposed development would be a maximum of two dwellings and due to the size of the site this would mean large plots, which would be in keeping with surrounding properties. It is considered due to the proximity of the existing houses in the village of Holywell the site could accommodate the development without significant and demonstrable harm on the rural character of the area. The scale, layout, appearance and design of the proposed dwellings including issues of landscaping would be crucial on this site but these are detailed matters not under

consideration at this stage. This will be determined at the technical details stage.

- 7.18 A number of neighbours have commented that this application means all Greenfield sites within the village would be open to development. They also commented that brownfield sites should be developed before land within the countryside. However the Local planning authority does not control what land comes forward for development and each application is assessed on its own merits.

Impact on the Heritage Assets

- 7.19 Paragraph 193 of the NPPF advises that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.
- 7.20 Section 66 of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990,- In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features. Section 72 of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.
- 7.21 A number of the representations have raised concerns about the development impacting on the village's conservation area and listed buildings. The Council's conservation officer has no objection in principle to the application at this stage. The proposed site lies outside the conservation area so harm would only be assessed against the impact on its setting and specifically views into and out of the conservation area. Due to screening and location of existing dwellings within the village, the application site is not considered to be within the setting of any listed buildings.
- 7.22 In terms of the impact on the adjacent conservation area, given the surrounding mixture of dwellings and size of the application site, it is considered the proposed development of up to 2 dwellings could be sufficiently well designed to mitigate their impact on the setting of the conservation area and views into and out of the conservation area. Whether this PIP constitutes development within the countryside is a moot point in terms of conservation. As stated, the detailed impact of a proposal for up to two dwelling on the character of the area would be fully assessed as part of a technical details application.

Residential Amenity.

- 7.23 Officers need to be satisfied at this stage that the site is capable of accommodating the amount of development proposed without having a detrimental impact on neighbour's amenity, including issues of noise as stated within the representations. Officers are confident of this, subject to design, scale and siting of dwellings at the technical

details stage where impacts of overshadowing, overbearing and overlooking will be fully assessed.

Highway Safety and Parking

- 7.24 The Local Highway Authority has not objected to the scheme in principle and is confident a safe access serving up to two dwellings could be achieved onto Back Lane (the preferred location for an access by the Parish Council). On a separate issue, access onto Back Lane would also be more in keeping with existing properties. Representations have commented on various highway safety issues within the area, however only highway safety issues with regards to this application can be assessed. The PIP regulations prohibit any form of conditions being imposed to this development and as such any information requested would either need to be submitted as part of any subsequent Technical Details Consent, or a new full planning application.

Drainage

- 7.25 Issues such as surface water and foul water drainage would be dealt with within a technical details application.

Ecology

- 7.26 Representations have been received with regards to ecology. The proposed development would not directly impact on designated nature conservation sites or known areas of priority habitat. Based on the location, scale and nature of the proposed development, there are not likely to be ecological issues which would make it inappropriate to determine this application as a permission in principle application.
- 7.27 However, potential ecological impacts must be addressed at the technical details stage, through provision of an ecological assessment, providing information on existing habitats, potential for protected species, and any necessary mitigation measures and in line with national planning policy, the detailed designs at technical detail stage should provide a net gain in biodiversity.

Other Matters

- 7.28 Representations have raised concerns with regards to utilities, however this not a material planning consideration. Comments have also been raised whether the PIP application has been advertised correctly by a site notice for 14 days. The Local Planning Authority erected a site notice on 28th February 2019. Motives behind developers submitting planning applications are not the concern of the Local Planning Authority. Finally within the representations a particular neighbour commented on other planning applications within the district which have been refused for reasons which are at stake as part of the current application. However each application is considered on its own merits.

Infrastructure Requirements and Planning Obligations

- 7.29 The Infrastructure Business Plan 2013/2014 (2013) was developed by the Growth and Infrastructure Group of the Huntingdonshire Local

Strategic Partnership. It helps to identify the infrastructure needs arising from the development proposed to 2036 through the Core Strategy

- 7.30 Statutory tests set out in the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (Regulation 122) require that S106 planning obligations must be:
- Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
 - Directly related to the development; and
 - Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL):

- 7.31 As this planning application is for a minor development, the development will be CIL liable in accordance with the Council's adopted charging schedule; CIL payments will cover footpaths and access, health, community facilities, libraries and lifelong learning and education.

Planning Balance & Conclusion:

- 7.32 This proposal would result in development outside of the built-up area of the settlement and would conflict with policies H23, En17 of the HLP and CS3 of the CS. S.38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (PCPA) 2004 and the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (section 70(2)) require that, in dealing with planning applications, the Local Planning Authority shall have regard to the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations. Para. 47 of the NPPF is clear that the Framework can override Development Plan policies which are not consistent with provisions of the NPPF and this is a material consideration in the determination of the application. Given the inconsistencies of the adopted housing supply policies with the NPPF, the 'tilted balance' set out in para. 11 of the NPPF is engaged and shifts the planning balance in favour of the grant of consent, unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.
- 7.33 The presumption in favour of sustainable development requires proposals to achieve economic, social and environmental gains; as such a balancing exercise has to be undertaken to weigh the benefits of the scheme against its disadvantages. The three components of sustainability have been assessed above however will be subject to the material planning considerations at the technical details stage.
- 7.34 Environmental harm as the proposal would not accord with development plan policies that seek to restrict development in the countryside. Further there would be moderate harm to the character and appearance of the area. It is also noted that there is local opposition to the proposal. There will however be an opportunity to mitigate against the impact of the development on the character of the area at technical details stage, where matters such as landscaping and screening will be considered. As discussed above, at this stage it is too early to identify an adverse impact upon the setting of the Conservation Area.

- 7.35 Ultimately, when considered in the round, and having regard to the fact that this is a PIP application, the proposal would contribute to the economic and social dimensions of sustainability with the addition of up to 2 residential units – moderate weight is attached to this benefit, the development will bring minor economic benefits through job creation in the construction industry (short term) and additional spent of future households in the local economy.
- 7.36 Overall, any harm identified on the rural character is not considered to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the scheme's benefits when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole at this stage. However this would be further assessed as part of a technical details application. This is a significant material consideration which outweighs the conflict with the Development Plan and therefore it is recommended that permission in principle should be granted.

8. RECOMMENDATION - APPROVAL

If you would like a translation of this document, a large text version or an audio version, please contact us on 01480 388388 and we will try to accommodate your needs.

CONTACT OFFICER:

Enquiries about this report to **Will Tysterman Senior Development Management Officer 01480 388411**

Sent: 26 February 2019 08:30
To: DevelopmentControl
Subject: Comments for Planning Application 19/00253/PIP

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 8:29 AM on 26 Feb 2019 from Miss Jane Bowd - Needingworth PC.

Application Summary

Address: Land West Of Barley Croft Back Lane Holywell

Proposal: Residential development

Case Officer: Will Tysterman

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: Miss Jane Bowd - Needingworth PC

Email: needingworthpc@btconnect.com

Address: Village Hall Overcote Lane, Needingworth,
Cambridgeshire PE27 4TU

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Town or Parish Council

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: It was not considered that there are any material planning reasons on which to object to this application, however Council have asked that the following comments be taken into consideration:

- the total number of developments the Parish has had approved recently all compounding infrastructure issues.
- the need for access/egress of the site to be on Back Lane.
- the need to improve the footpath along Back Lane that the entrance will cross.

That no house should be built directly on the corner of Mill Way and Back Lane as this will obstruct visibility on what is a dangerous corner.

Council believe that under the Town & Country planning (permission in principle)(amendment) order 2017 that a 14 day notice of development should have been posted near the site. We do not believe this has been displayed.