Application Number: F/YR13/0527/F

Minor

Parish/Ward: Parson Drove/Wisbech St Mary

Date Received: 04 July 2013 Expiry Date: 29 August 2013 Applicant: Mr T Gamble

Agent: Mr D Broker, David Broker Design Services

Proposal: Erection of a 2-storey 4 bed dwelling with detached double garage.

Location: Land north east of 3 Clarkes Cottages, North Brink, Wisbech

Site Area/Density: 0.07ha / 7 dph

Reason before Committee: This application is before committee given that an elected Member is acting as agent for the scheme. Should this not have been the case it would have been determined under delegated powers by Officers.

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY/RECOMMENDATION

The site is positioned within an isolated location, over 2km from the nearest established settlement. No justification has been provided for the erection of a dwelling within this countryside location. It is acknowledged that there are other sporadic dwellings within the vicinity however these have been justified by virtue of a previous set of planning policies (which have now been deleted), and/or are historic or replacement housing stock. The site is located within Flood Zone 3 (FZ3), which is classed as being at the highest risk of flooding and yet the flood risk assessment fails to adequately address the risk of flooding within the area. Both the emerging Core Strategy and the NPPF require new developments to be located within areas of lower flood risk before land within FZ3 is released. It is widely accepted that there is land, especially for a single plot, available within the District which is located within Flood Zones 1 and 2. The proposal therefore fails on both flood risk and sustainability grounds and accordingly is recommended for refusal.

2. **HISTORY**

F/YR00/0092/F Erection of a dwelling Granted 05.14.2000

3. PLANNING POLICIES

3.1 National Planning Policy Framework:

Paragraph 2: Planning law requires that application for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan.

Paragraph 14: Presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Paragraph 17: Seek to ensure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants.

Paragraph 100: Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided.

3.2 **Draft Fenland Core Strategy:**

CS3: Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarhy

CS12: Rural Areas Development Policy

CS14: Responding to Climate Change and Managing the Risk of Flooding in

Fenland

CS16: Delivering High Quality Environments

3.3 Fenland District Wide Local Plan:

E8: Landscape and amenity protection

H3: Development Area Boundary/Protection of Character and Amenity/Highway

Safety

4. **CONSULTATIONS**

4.1 4.2	Wisbech Town Council: Wisbech St Mary Parish Council:	Recommend approval. Support and recommend approval
4.3	Natural England:	Standard comments, the LPA should request a survey if it is aware of any protected species on site.
4.4	Wildlife Trust:	Not received at time of report.
4.5	Environment Agency:	Object to the proposal. The FRA does not comply with the requirements of the NPPF.
4.6	North Level Drainage Board:	No comments.
4.7	FDC Environmental Protection	No objections, contaminated land is not
	Officer:	considered to an issue.
4.8	FDC Tree Officer:	A method statement and tree protection

4.9 **Neighbours:**

A method statement and tree protection plan should be provided via a condition should planning permission be granted. 1 representation received, objecting to the

proposal on the following grounds:

- loss of light,
- loss of view,
- damage to foundations,
- loss of privacy,
- the site is not large enough to accommodate a dwelling,
- the site is a former garden so it would not have had an access onto the highway,
- impact on the trees,

 loss of electricity to neighbouring properties due to location of electricity pole.

5. SITE DESCRIPTION

5.1 The site is located along the rural part of North Brink, approximately 600m from where North Brink meets Mouth Lane. The site is currently laid to grass and is bound to the north, east and south by landscaping. The site is within an isolated countryside location.

6. PLANNING ASSESSMENT

- 6.1 The key considerations for this application are:
 - Policy implications
 - History
 - Design and layout
 - Flood Risk
 - Other Matters

(a) Policy implications

The site is located beyond any established settlement and within a countryside location. There are some sporadic residential developments in the area, however there are no areas that could be regarded as continuous built up frontages. The application seeks full planning permission for a 2-storey 4-bed dwelling with associated parking area and amenity space.

The NPPF seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas where it will maintain the vitality of rural communities. This is further supported by the policies within the Local Plan and Emerging Core Strategy where it is determined that new development in villages will be supported where it contributes to the sustainability of the settlement and does not harm the wide, open character of the countryside.

Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy – February 2013 is relevant in this instance and lists the general good practice criteria. The criteria listed in this policy details that the site should be in or adjacent to the existing developed footprint of the village, would not result in coalescence with neighbouring villages, would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside, should be in keeping with the shape and form of the settlement, respects natural boundaries, not result in the loss of high grade agricultural nor result in risks or unacceptable nuisances to residents and businesses. This site is an existing garden which sits in an isolated location amongst a small group of dwellings forming sporadic development. It is acknowledged that there are some residential properties in the surrounding area, however it is considered that this development does not comply with Policy CS12 as it is not adjacent to the existing developed footprint and is considered to have an adverse impact on the character of the locality. In addition it is considered that the site is not in a sustainable location. The intensification of residential use in this isolated location is considered to be harmful to the character and appearance of the open countryside.

No special circumstances have been put forward to indicate that this development is essential in terms of the effective management of a local rural enterprise, as required by adopted and emerging policies.

(b) History

Planning permission for a new dwelling was granted on this site in 2000. It was granted on the basis that is was an infill plot in accordance with policy H16 of the Local Plan. This policy was deleted under the 2007 revisions and as such there is now no longer a policy support for infill housing within the open countryside. As per 6.1 (a) of this report it is acknowledged that there are other dwellings within the area however it is important to note that the dwellings were granted for special circumstances which are not relevant to the current proposal: The properties 1, 2, 3 and 4 Clarkes Cottages are historic and therefore do not benefit from recent planning consent. The existing dwelling 'Neneside' was granted planning permission on the basis of the infill policy H16 which has now been deleted and the neighbouring dwelling to the east 'Chestnut House' is a replacement dwelling.

(c) Design and Layout

The dwelling has a standard, contemporary appearance and will be positioned towards the centre of the site. The garage, parking and turning area will be located to the front of the dwelling with the access sited between the existing trees to the front of the site. Although the design and layout of the proposal could be accepted it remains that the principle of the proposal would be contrary to countryside housing and sustainability principles.

(d) Flood Risk

The site is located within Flood Zone 3 which is classed as being at the highest risk of flooding and yet the flood risk assessment fails to adequately address the risk of flooding within the area. Both the emerging Core Strategy and the NPPF require new developments to be located within areas of lower flood risk before land within Flood Zone 3 is released. It is widely accepted that there is land, especially for a single plot, available within the District which is located within Flood Zones 1 and 2. The proposal therefore fails to satisfy the planned sustainable growth of the District, contrary to CS14 of the emerging Core Strategy. Comments have been received from the Environment Agency objecting to the proposal on the basis that the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) is not acceptable. In view of the high risk flood zone it is considered imperative that the FRA adequately addresses the risk of flooding within the area.

(e) Other Matters

The comments received from the Town and Parish Councils have been noted however unfortunately they are not sufficient to overcome the fundamental issues with the principle of the proposal. The comments from the neighbouring property have also been noted however the concerns raised are not considered to be an issue given the scale and layout of the site and the comments received from other professional consultees.

7. CONCLUSION

7.1 The proposal constitutes unjustified residential development within the open countryside. Although there is some sporadic housing within the vicinity these have been justified through a previous set of planning policies and/or are historic housing stock. The site is within an isolated location, over 2km from the established settlement of Guyhirn and over 3km from the established settlement of Wisbech. The development is therefore contrary to countryside housing policies and sustainability principles as outlined in the Local Plan, the emerging Core Strategy and government guidance contained within the NPPF.

In addition the site is located within an area at high risk of flooding and the submission fails to adequately address the flood risks arising from the development.

For the reasons above it is considered that the proposal is contrary to the provisions of the Development Plan and national guidance and it is therefore recommended that planning permission is refused.

8. RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

- 1. The proposal represents unjustified residential development within a countryside location, contrary to H3 of the Fenland District Wide Local Plan, CS3 and CS12 of the Fenland Local Plan Core Strategy (proposed submission 2013) and Section 6 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2. The development is located within Flood Zone 3 despite there being land available within areas of lower flood risk and the submitted flood risk assessment fails to adequately address the risks arising from the development. The application is therefore contrary to CS14 of the Fenland Local Plan Core Strategy (proposed submission 2013) and Section 10 of the National Planning Policy Framework.



© Crown Copyright and database rights 2013 Ordnance Survey 10023778

F/YR13/0598/F Scale = 1:1,250



