

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 3 FEBRUARY 2016

Application Number	3/15/1691/OUT
Proposal	Outline planning application for a development of up to 8 dwellings with all matters reserved except points of access onto Green End (B1368)
Location	Land East of Green End Farm, Green End, Braughing
Applicant	The Fairfield Partnership
Parish	Braughing
Ward	Braughing

Date of Registration of Application	19 August 2015
Target Determination Date	14 October 2015
Reason for Committee Report	Referred by Local Member
Case Officer	Hazel Izod

RECOMMENDATION:

That outline planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the conditions set out at the end of this report.

1.0 Summary

- 1.1 This application seeks outline permission for a development of up to 8 dwellings with all matters reserved except for access. The site lies outside the Braughing village boundary and therefore within the Rural Area beyond the Green Belt. Regard must be had to the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in paragraph 14 of the NPPF given the Council's lack of a 5 year housing supply. The site is well located in relation to public transport, village services, and employment opportunities and will provide some economic benefit, and social benefit through the provision of 40% affordable housing. Officers consider the proposal to amount to a sustainable form of development and therefore permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.
- 1.2 A previous outline application for up to 10 dwellings (3/14/0094/OP) was refused by Members on the grounds that the elevated position of the site above Green End, and the physical alterations necessary to the frontage of the site, would result in an unduly prominent and harmful form of development. This application reduces the number of dwellings from 10 to 8, relocates the units further away from the highway, relocates the vehicular access further north and detaches the pedestrian access. It also provides an informal play area to the east of

the site, additional tree planting, and a less engineered frontage. Additional section drawings have also been submitted with this application.

- 1.3 Following consultation with Landscape and Conservation Officers who had previously objected to the proposal, and the submission of amended plans, Officers are now satisfied that it is possible to achieve a development of up to 8 units on this site that will assimilate reasonably well without unacceptable landscape and visual impacts on the surrounding countryside or harm to the Conservation Area. Although the development and frontage alterations will inevitably have some impact, it is no longer considered that this results in harm that significantly and demonstrably outweighs the benefits of the scheme.
- 1.4 The development will result in no harm to highway safety or capacity, can provide adequate car parking, and will cause no harm to neighbour amenity or ecology. The scheme also makes provision for an appropriate drainage scheme, relevant to the scale of development proposed. The application is therefore recommended for approval subject to the conditions set out at the end of this report.

2.0 Site Description

- 2.1 The application site is shown on the attached OS extract and comprises 0.72 hectares of vacant land located to the north of Green End and outside the village boundary of Braughing. To the north of the site is an access track with open fields beyond; to the east is the B1368 road with the Pound Close residential development opposite; to the south is neighbouring residential land, and to the west is Green End Farm.
- 2.2 There is a public footpath (Footpath 001) that runs along the southern boundary of the site with steps connecting to the B1368. The site rises steeply from east to west with a maximum height difference of some 8 metres, and includes a raised bank adjacent to the road (approximately 1 metre higher) with a hawthorn hedge on top. The site comprises of mostly unmanaged grassland, scrub vegetation and tree/hedge screening along its boundaries.
- 2.3 The site was apparently formerly used for agricultural purposes and the applicant has made reference to the remains of a previous structure and hard-standing on site, but this has blended into the landscape and Officers therefore consider the site to be greenfield.

3.0 Background to Proposal

- 3.1 This application is a re-submission and follows a previous refusal for a development of up to 10 dwellings (3/14/0094/OP), which was refused for the following reason:

The proposed development, by reason of the elevated position of the site above Green End and the physical alterations necessary to the frontage of the site, would appear unduly prominent in the street scene and wider landscape, and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Braughing Conservation Area contrary to policies ENV1, BH6 and GBC14 of the East Herts Local Plan Second Review April 2007, and Sections 7 and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 3.2 No appeal was lodged against that refusal and the applicant has sought subsequent advice through the Council's pre-application advice service.
- 3.3 This application is again in outline form with all matters reserved, except for access, for up to 8 dwellings with a new access to the B1368. Although layout is a reserved matter, an indicative layout has been submitted to indicate how the proposed development could be achieved. A parameters plan has also been submitted to inform the design of any subsequent reserved matters application. The application is again accompanied by a Planning, Design and Access Statement, a Landscape Appraisal, Tree Survey, Transport Assessment, Surface Water Drainage Assessment, Utility Report, and Habitat Survey.
- 3.4 Amended plans have been submitted during the course of the application and have been subject to full re-consultation. These plans include complete removal of the frontage hedgerow which was originally proposed to be retained, for visibility purposes.

4.0 Key Policy Issues

- 4.1 These relate to the relevant policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the adopted East Herts Local Plan 2007:

Key Issue	NPPF	Local Plan policy
Principle of Sustainable Development	Paragraph 14	SD2
New housing in the Rural Area	Section 6	GBC3
Landscape and visual impact	Section 11	ENV1, GBC14
Access and parking	Section 4	TR2, 7

Scale, design and layout	Section 7	ENV1
Impact on trees/hedgerows	Section 11	ENV2, 11

Other relevant issues are referred to in the 'Consideration of Relevant Issues' section below.

5.0 Emerging District Plan

5.1 In relation to the key issues identified above, the policies contained in the emerging District Plan do not differ significantly from those contained in the adopted Local Plan and the NPPF as identified above. Given its stage in preparation, little weight can currently be accorded to the emerging Plan.

6.0 Summary of Consultee Responses

6.1 The Highway Authority do not wish to restrict the grant of permission subject to conditions. They comment that the application is acceptable in principle from a highways context. The B1368 is a secondary distributor road and the proposed access is near to the point where the speed limit changes from 30mph to 40mph. Traffic impact will not be significant for the size of development proposed. The access arrangements are acceptable apart from the proposed footway not extending far enough to link up with the existing right of way network, and a condition is recommended to cover this point. A gateway feature is also requested to the north of the new entrance on the B1368 which could include the relocated 30/40mph speed limit signs but this will need to be reviewed in accordance with the highways speed management strategy. They also recommend a condition to require a suitable on-site turning facility. They also request that the width of Footpath 001 be widened to 4 metres as the outline plans show part of the route to be fenced off as back gardens for the proposed housing. The proposed hedging on the rest of the route will need to be planted a minimum of 1 metre away from this 4 metre clear footpath width to allow for future growth and landowner access for maintenance.

6.2 The Public Rights of Way Service request that the width of Footpath 001 be widened to 4 metres as the outline plans show part of the route to be fenced off as back gardens. The proposed hedging/vegetation screen will need to be planted a minimum of 1 metre away from the 4 metre clear footpath width to allow for future growth and landowner access for maintenance. These matters should be addressed when submitting a final layout at reserved matters stage.

- 6.3 The Ramblers Association comment that Footpath 001 lies adjacent to the site and the development should not encroach on or obstruct this public right of way during or after the construction period, with the legal width maintained throughout its length.
- 6.4 Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust comment that the submitted ecological report makes some acceptable suggestions as to what could be done to mitigate and enhance the site; however these are not definitively stated. A condition is therefore recommended to require an ecological mitigation and enhancement plan prior to the commencement of development.
- 6.5 Herts Ecology raise no objection subject to conditions. They agree with the conclusions in the submitted ecological report and comment that the development provides opportunities for ecological gain.
- 6.6 Historic England advise that the application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of the Conservation Officer's advice.
- 6.7 Natural England has no comments to make on the application.
- 6.8 The Historic Environment Unit comment that the site is in Area of Archaeological Significance No. 60 as identified in the Local Plan, which includes the medieval and later settlements of Braughing and Braughing Green End. The development site is adjacent to the medieval and earlier highway linking Ware, Puckeridge and Braughing with Cambridge. Finds of earlier prehistoric date are known from the field to the north of the site and from 50 Green End (a copper-alloy flat axehead of early Bronze Age date and an early Neolithic flint tool). Further Neolithic worked flints were recovered from archaeological excavations at the adjacent Pound Close development, as well as evidence of medieval occupation and animal husbandry. They therefore consider the proposal likely to impact on heritage assets of archaeological interest and recommend a condition to secure a programme of archaeological work.
- 6.9 Thames Water comment that it is the responsibility of the developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water drainage it is recommended that the applicant ensures storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. They raise no objection to the proposal in respect of sewerage infrastructure capacity. Where a developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required.

With regard to water supply this comes within the area covered by Affinity Water Company.

- 6.10 The Environment Agency comments that they did not need to be consulted.
- 6.11 The County Minerals and Waste Team comment that regard should be had to policies 1, 2 and 12 of the Hertfordshire County Council Waste Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document 2012 which forms part of the development plan in determining this application.
- 6.12 The Council's Engineers comment that the proposal is not considered as sustainable construction and is likely to increase flood risk for the site and adjacent land. The site is located in floodzone 1 and is greenfield/permeable. The new development will increase the amount of impermeable area on site, and additional volumes of surface water would be likely to increase flood risk. The submitted Surface Water Design Statement proposes the use of traditional piped drainage assessment, an element of permeable paving, and a geocell arrangement. Underground storage tanks are difficult and expensive to maintain. The applicant discounts green roofs on design grounds, and attenuation ponds and swales on spatial and topographical grounds; however the Engineers consider that all these drainage options would be feasible.
- 6.13 They also comment that the development does not appear to have adopted the recommendations of the East Herts Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). The proposed drainage system is considered to be medium to poor quality Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) which are likely to require an enhanced specialist maintenance programme, and provide little water quality improvements or wildlife/biodiversity provision. It is possible that a range of higher quality SuDS and green infrastructure could be added to the design, and this would help to reduce flood risk and improve water quality and enhance biodiversity.
- 6.14 The Landscape Officer initially recommended refusal on the grounds of an adverse impact on the hedgerow along the B1368 – it is likely that much of it will need to be removed and potentially re-grading works to lower the embankment for visibility sightlines. He also commented that the development would appear prominent and overbearing to Pound Close and for other users of the B1368 entering or leaving the village. He commented that the development would have an urbanising effect on the site and surrounding landscape, and due to the topography of

the site and density, height and scale of the buildings, would not assimilate well into its surroundings and appear incongruous in longer views.

- 6.15 Following the submission of amended plans the Landscape Officer recommends approval and comments that a new hedgerow is proposed in mitigation for removal of the hedgerow along the B1368, and although this is set back from the line of the existing hedge, the use of contract grown hedging will give an instant hedge replacement. There is no obvious reason, however, why it cannot continue up to the proposed access road on both sides to give better enclosure of the site. In respect of the wider impact, he comments that the impact on the immediate surroundings is now reduced by the setting back of Plots 1 and 2 from the road and the reinstatement of a new boundary hedge. The profile of the regraded bank will give a less engineered appearance and will reduce the adverse impact on the character and appearance of the village. The section drawings show that it is possible to achieve a development that will assimilate reasonably well into this end of village location without unacceptable landscape and visual impact on the immediate surroundings or from longer views. However, this remains dependent on building ridge heights. The indicative heights to Plots 1 and 2 are likely to be acceptable but this may not be so where ridge heights become higher for those dwellings on the more elevated western part of the site where a low rise design such as bungalow dwellings may be appropriate.
- 6.16 Environmental Health Officers recommend approval subject to conditions on construction hours of working, contamination, and piling works. In respect of land contamination they comment that given the circumstances of the previous land use as farmland, they consider as a minimum that a desk-top survey should be undertaken.
- 6.17 The Housing Officer comments that, given the location of the site adjacent to the Category 1 Village boundary, 40% affordable housing provision would be expected to make the development sustainable. They note that the scheme proposes 8 dwellings with 3 affordable (40%). The 3 affordable units should have a tenure split of 75% rent and 25% shared ownership.
- 6.18 The County Council Planning Obligations Team comment that, for a scheme of 10 dwellings, planning obligations would be sought towards first school education for the expansion of Jenyns School, middle school education towards the expansion of Ralph Sadlier Middle School by 1 form of entry to 4 forms of entry, and library services for the provision of improved shelving solutions for the children's area at

Buntingford Library. They also seek fire hydrant provision. Although there is a need for Early Years services in this Children's Centre Area, contributions are not sought as a result of the limitations imposed by Regulation 124 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (CIL Regs).

- 6.19 The Conservation Officer initially commented that, should the vegetation be retained, its screening effect would mean that the proposal would have no or insignificant impact on the setting of either the Conservation Area or listed buildings in the area. Notwithstanding this they raised concerns that the access arrangements do not make efficient use of the existing lane (albeit it is in different ownership) and the number of houses proposed is leading to a rather suburban layout which could bear better design. For example, the character of the road and adjacent part of the Conservation Area is that buildings address the street, which this layout fails to do.
- 6.20 In response to amended plans they recommend consent and comment that the frontage part of the site is likely to have been included when designating the Conservation Area to protect hedgerows or other boundary treatments deemed to make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the surrounding area. They note that the hedgerow is now proposed to be removed and a new hedge planted further into the site to improve visibility splays from the new junction. Nevertheless were the new hedgerow planted in indigenous species they would be content for this amendment to be approved.

7.0 Parish Council Representations

7.1 Braughing Parish Council objects on the following grounds:

- Future housing development in Group 1 Villages should be delivered in accordance with local initiatives led by Parish Councils;
- New development should be limited to the built-up area in accordance with draft policy VILL1;
- The Parish Council is preparing its Braughing Parish Neighbourhood Plan which includes a search for sites and it is premature to suppose where those sites might be identified;
- The plan proposes a 10% growth in Braughing for 2016-2031, equating to 33 new homes. Permission has been granted for 71 new homes in Braughing Parish since April 2007 (48 within the village) with 52 complete and there has been a constant presence of building contractors in the village which has had an impact on rural life;
- Impact on access to healthcare in Puckeridge with waiting times

increasing;

- Any buildings on the site will have an impact on local character and amenity given the significant levels – contrary to policies ENV1 and HSG7 (draft policy DES1);
- The field has a steep bank from the road with the resulting impact of increased height of any buildings from the street level causing overbearing and overshadowing. The developers at Pound Close were required to build below street level to prevent an overbearing effect on the street scene in the Conservation Area – contrary to policies ENV1 and HSG7 (draft policy DES1);
- Building on high land in the village should be avoided, such as Pentlows Farm;
- The proposal fails to enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area – contrary to policy BH6 (draft policy HA4);
- The site lies outside the village boundary, and the draft District Plan boundary – contrary to policy OSV1 (draft policy VILL1);
- The site lies in the Rural Area and the proposal does not meet the specified criteria – contrary to policy GBC3 (draft policy GBR2);
- No mention of how the public footpath will be designed/maintained – contrary to policy LRC9;
- The site is not previously developed land – contrary to policy HSG1;
- The new access will create a significant hazard to road users and pedestrians, and will be very close to existing accesses at Pound Close and Gravelly Lane – contrary to policy TR2 (draft policy TRA2);
- The Transport Statement underestimates parking provision and vehicle movements – only 6 two way trips are predicted to be added to AM and PM peak hours;
- The submitted Traffic Survey identifies a speeding issue with 85th percentile speeds being up to 66.2mph between 5-7am, between 53.2 and 76.4mph between 3-7am on most days of the week, and a maximum 102.8mph recorded between 10-11pm. The Parish Council has referred this matter to the Police;
- Vehicle speeds and numbers vary significantly from a Police survey carried out in 2006 (traffic movements would appear to have halved which is unlikely) – they therefore question the accuracy of the applicant's submissions. The Parish Council have since received the results of a further Police survey carried out in May 2015 with similar results to the one carried out in 2006;
- There is insufficient access to jobs, shops and services by modes other than by car and few local employment opportunities. It is inconceivable to believe that residents could be expected to cycle to work or to shop. The public transport system is restrictive and does not support the needs of local residents – contrary to policy

TR1 (draft policy TRA1);

- The site is on a steep gradient and this area of Green End is already known to flood following heavy rain. The introduction of further non-permeable road surfaces will reduce the absorption capacity and increase flooding on and off site – contrary to policy ENV21 (draft policy WAT4).

8.0 Summary of Other Representations

8.1 72 no. letters of objection have been received, including one from the Braughing Society, which can be summarised as follows:

- The site lies outside of the village boundary and in the Rural Area Beyond the Green Belt;
- The proposal will not preserve or enhance the Conservation Area;
- Nothing has changed since the previous application;
- The application is premature as the Parish Council has not yet identified future development sites;
- Permission has been granted for 71 houses in the Parish since 2007 with a constant presence of building contractors in the village;
- No need for further development in Braughing and Braughing should not be penalised for the Council's delays in producing a District Plan;
- The proposed housing density is inappropriate;
- Preference should be given to developing brownfield sites;
- The new access will cause a hazard as it is on a blind bend and close to existing road junctions;
- No footpath on the west side of the B1368 so pedestrians would have to cross in this hazardous location;
- Speeding issue on the B1368 will cause a danger;
- Insufficient car parking proposed on site;
- Public transport is inadequate – residents will be dependent on cars;
- Loss of environmental importance of the field;
- Loss of valuable hedgerow adjacent to the B1368;
- Harm to wildlife including bats, slow worms, owls, deer, badgers, newts and red kites;
- The site is on a steep bank and new buildings will harm the landscape character of the area;
- The site is part of an ancient field known as Saffron Ground which was once part of the medieval manor of Braughingbury and there is no historical evidence of development here;
- The elevated position of the site and modifications to landscaping of the road frontage will inevitably cause harm to the rural

character of the village;

- Proposed planting will provide little screening as only full leaf cover for 4 months of the year;
- Overlooking, overbearing and overshadowing to properties in Pound Close opposite, especially with removal of the hedge;
- Overlooking and loss of privacy to Ravenscroft flank bedrooms;
- Limited services and infrastructure in the village to support new development;
- Proposed development is unsustainable;
- Increased pressure on Jenyns School which is close to capacity;
- Few local employment opportunities;
- No healthcare service within walking distance – Puckeridge and Buntingford are over-subscribed;
- The area is known for flooding and further non-permeable surfaces will increase the level of flood risk;
- Inadequate drainage proposals;
- Proposed play area is dangerously close to the B1368;
- Insufficient information on the design of the buildings;
- Affordable housing does not normally provide housing for local people;
- Would set a precedent for further ribbon development north on the B1368;
- Need to prevent further degradation of this historic village.

8.2 1 no. letter of support has been received and comments that the site is well placed for access to services and bus routes and will not impact on the Quinn Valley landscape. They comment that the village has not had the opportunity to comment on what they would like done on this site as it has not been put forward by the landowner for consideration through the Neighbourhood Plan, and they raise no objection if approval of this site would go towards the required housing supply for the village.

9.0 Planning History

Ref	Proposal	Decision	Date
3/14/0094/OP	Outline planning application for a development of up to 10 dwellings with all matters reserved except highway access onto Green End (B1368)	Refused	01.05.2014

10.0 Consideration of Relevant Issues

Principle of Development

- 10.1 The site lies outside the defined village boundary of Braughing and therefore within the Rural Area Beyond the Green Belt wherein policy GBC3 only allows for specific forms of development, not including new residential developments. The proposal therefore represents inappropriate development in principle, and regard must be had to any other material considerations, including policies contained in the NPPF.
- 10.2 Paragraph 14 of the NPPF sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development and also states that ‘where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.’
- 10.3 The Council has acknowledged its lack of a 5 year housing supply and the need for housing in the district. It is therefore acknowledged that, in respect of the wording of the NPPF, the Council’s settlement boundaries and housing allocations are based on the 2007 Local Plan and are now be considered to be out of date. Whilst work is on-going on the District Plan to provide a full 5 year housing supply, the Plan is still in draft form and can only be given limited weight in the balance of considerations. Officers acknowledge that the proposed development would make a contribution towards the Council’s deficit in housing supply, but this must be balanced against any harm arising from the development.
- 10.4 In terms of sustainability, Officers acknowledge that, although the site lies outside the village boundary, it is reasonably well located in relation to village services and infrastructure, and there is a bus stop approximately 200 metres south of the site providing Monday-Saturday services to Hertford and Royston (route 331), and a very limited service to Bishop’s Stortford and Stevenage (route 386). The development will also provide some economic benefit during construction, and the provision of new housing, including affordable housing, would perform a social role. The development will have some environmental impact given the loss of a greenfield site and the likely reliance on private vehicles; however overall, and subject to detailed design criteria, Officers consider the proposal to amount to a sustainable form of development.

- 10.5 In making this assessment Officers have had regard to a recent appeal decision for up to 60 houses on land north of Green End (reference 3/14/1448/OP), which was recently dismissed on landscape and visual impact grounds. In making her decision, the Inspector stated that “the site is within reasonable walking distance of a wide range of facilities. Although not every need is catered for (including employment) and public transport is limited, it would be a relatively sustainable site for new housing in a rural location.” That site was located further north of the village than the site proposed in this case.
- 10.6 Officers have also had regard to the capacity of Braughing to accommodate new development given that the village has experienced a number of new developments in recent years, including the Gravelly Lane site (Pound Close opposite), and Pentlows Farm. Whilst Officers sympathise with the disruption caused by construction in the village in recent years, any disruption caused by the construction process would be temporary and is not a reason, in planning terms, to refuse permission. Both of these developed sites are located within the village boundary, and Pentlows Farm was allocated for housing development in the 2007 Local Plan. The draft District Plan proposes that Braughing be classified as a Group 1 Village wherein a 10% growth could be accommodated within the 2016-2031 period subject to a Neighbourhood Plan. This amounts to a minimum of 33 new dwellings.
- 10.7 The Parish Council and local residents have objected to the scheme on the grounds that the proposal is premature as work is on-going on the Neighbourhood Plan, which will allocate sites for housing development within the village for the period 2016-2031. No decisions have yet been reached on the overall development strategy for the village, and given the current status of the Neighbourhood Plan, it can only carry limited weight. Whilst Officers understand these concerns, the current proposal cannot be deemed to be premature, and given the Council’s acknowledged housing shortfall, it is necessary to consider each case on its own merits.
- 10.8 In having regard to the Draft District Plan and the proposed 10% growth figure, Officers do not consider that the construction of 8 new dwellings would cause harm to the infrastructure and service capacity of the village. Whilst concerns have been raised over primary school capacity, the County Council has commented that a financial contribution would be sought to secure future expansion of the school. However, financial contributions can only be sought for developments of 10 or more dwellings, in accordance with the Council’s Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document. Given that the proposal has been reduced to 8 dwellings, the proposal does not trigger this requirement

and no financial contributions would be justified.

- 10.9 Overall Officers consider that development of this site can be considered to represent a sustainable form of development in terms of economic, social and environmental issues, and the scale of the proposed development is not considered harmful to the capacity of the existing infrastructure and services in the village. However, there are a number of other issues considered in more detail below, having regard to the previous refusal.

Landscape and Visual Impact

- 10.10 The site lies in Landscape Character Area (LCA) 91 'Upper Rib Valley' which is described in the Landscape Character Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) as an undulating arable valley, generally quite open but narrowing towards Standon. It has been identified with a strong sense of character and a moderate condition, resulting in a strategy to 'conserve and restore'. Although the site itself is relatively contained by mature vegetation, the development will have some impact on the local landscape, and the character of the village by extending the built form of development to the north of the settlement. However, Officers consider the site to form a natural termination of the built plan form of the village.
- 10.11 The site currently comprises of a vacant field with grassland, scrub and boundary hedging/trees. A full tree survey has again been submitted which identifies a Category A group of trees and 2 no. Category A single trees, one of which is an ash tree within the centre of the site that is to be retained and protected, and has informed the layout of the site. There are a number of other trees along the boundaries of the site that have been identified as worthy of retention and will be retained with an enhanced planting buffer along the northern and western boundaries. A landscape strategy has been submitted which sets out the proposed landscape works and specifies a 5 metre wide native tree belt to the north and west boundaries with any existing gaps filled. This will largely obscure views of the development from the north and west of the site.
- 10.12 There is an existing hawthorn hedge along the roadside boundary of the site, positioned on top of a raised bank. This was proposed to be removed in the previous application and raised objections from both the Landscape and Conservation Officers. It was then proposed to be partly retained on initial submission of this application but, following further assessments of visibility requirements, was again proposed to be removed in its entirety with the bank re-graded. Section drawings have been submitted to show the visibility requirements, and the re-

positioning of a replacement hedge further back from the street. The applicant proposes a new native mixed hedge to be planted along the top of the re-graded embankment. This will be planted as an 'instant' hedge supplied at a height of approximately 1.5 metres and would become a fully established feature after 5-7 years. New native trees will also be planted within the hedge. Full details of this planting can be secured through the landscaping details in a reserved matters application.

- 10.13 The existing hedge has not been identified as important in its species mix or age to be classed as protected and whilst it is agreed that it makes a contribution to the street scene, its loss and replacement with a new hedge is not considered to be so harmful as to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits in this case. Through further assessment and submissions, both the Landscape and Conservation Officers have removed their objections to the removal of this hedge.
- 10.14 It is still necessary, given the levels difference, to re-grade the banks to facilitate vehicular and pedestrian access to the site. The banks to the vehicular access are proposed to be landscaped using mainly evergreen ground cover shrubs, and grass banks would be avoided to reduce maintenance requirements. These banks are proposed at a 1:3 gradient and would therefore not appear unduly steep. Additional section drawings have been submitted with this application, along with detailed vehicular access and visibility splay drawings. This indicates that although engineering works are still required to the frontage, including removal of the hedge, the resultant impact is no longer considered to be unduly urban or out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area.
- 10.15 Overall Officers consider that the reduced width of the access and its relocation further north, and provision of more detailed section drawings indicates that the works required to the frontage have been significantly reduced since the previous refusal, and that no harm would now arise to the rural character of this part of the village.
- 10.16 The submitted Landscape Appraisal sets out that the site is visually well enclosed and therefore lies mainly out of sight except in close range views. The applicant also submits that the site makes no positive contribution towards the character of the LCA, or the village, and that it is physically and visually separated from the open countryside by established tree belts. They state that "glimpses of the new houses would be seen within the enclosing tree belts at the edge of the settlement, and further visual enclosure of the new housing would be achieved by the proposed internal structural planting." A landscape

strategy is again proposed which will retain and enhance the existing tree belts to the north and west boundaries.

- 10.17 The Landscape Officer has removed his objection following the submission of additional drawings and now comments that, although it is inevitable that a new housing development will have an urbanising effect on the landscape, the impact on the immediate surroundings is now reduced by the setting back of the nearest dwellings from the road, the reinstatement of the hedge, and with an adjusted profile of the bank to give a less engineered appearance. The overall effect is a reduced impact on the character and appearance of the village. Officers are therefore satisfied that the previous reason for refusal has been addressed through this amended scheme.
- 10.18 In respect of the wider landscape, the Landscape Officer is now satisfied that it is possible to achieve a development on this site that will assimilate reasonably well in this location without unacceptable landscape and visual impacts on the surrounding countryside. This is dependent, however, on building ridge heights which are only in outline form at this stage. Officers consider that the indicative heights to Plots 1 and 2 are likely to be acceptable, but the heights of those buildings on the more elevated western part of the site should be restricted. The indicative plans show buildings heights up to 8 metres for Plots 5-8 and up to 11 metres for Plots 3 and 4. Although the Landscape Officer's concerns are noted, your Officers consider that the principle of 8 metre high ridge heights would not be unduly harmful. The main ridge to Ravenscroft located due south of the site is also approximately 8 metres high and is on similar land levels. However, the proposed 11 metre height to Plots 3 and 4 is considered to be excessive and harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. A condition is therefore recommended to restrict building heights to 8 metres above existing ground levels for any reserved matters application.

Access and Parking

- 10.19 Full details of the access arrangements have been submitted as this matter is to be determined in full. The application proposes a new vehicular access to the B1368 to the west of the site, in the form of a simple priority junction. The access has been relocated further north since the previous refusal. Re-grading is still required given the difference in levels to the road and a new footpath is now proposed to the south of the site to provide pedestrian access and level access to Footpath 001. A dropped tactile kerb crossing point is also proposed to connect with the existing footpath on the eastern side of the road. The Highway Authority have recommended a condition to secure an

extended section of footway between the new footpath and Footpath 001 which Officers consider reasonable and necessary to connect the development with the existing right of way network and provide a safe crossing point.

- 10.20 The B1368 is a classified secondary distributor road connecting a number of villages with the A10 at Puckeridge. The proposed access is located approximately 15 metres north of the point where the speed limit changes from 30mph to 40mph, and in close proximity to both Gravelly Lane and Pound Close on the eastern side of the road. The Highway Authority have requested that the developer provides a new village gateway feature to identify the entrance to the village. However, given the modest scale of development proposed, Officers do not consider it reasonable to require this by condition as it is not considered to meet the tests for conditions set out in the NPPG. There has also been a suggestion to relocate the speed limit signs but this would need to be reviewed in accordance with the Highways Speed Management Strategy and is not reasonable to require through this submission.
- 10.21 A number of concerns have been raised over speeding traffic in the vicinity of the site and the Parish Council have submitted Police survey data from 2006 and May 2015 which highlight the issue of speeding traffic. The Highway Authority are aware of this speeding issue and have had discussions with the Police. The applicant proposes to extend the 30mph zone further north; however this would need to be in accordance with the County Council's Highways and Transportation Speed Strategy and apparently no plans are currently in place. Officers do not consider it reasonable on the basis of the Highway Authority's comments to secure this as part of this application. This was equally not identified as an issue by the Inspector in dismissing Gladman's development north of Green End where 60 houses were proposed further north in the 40mph zone.
- 10.22 The Parish Council have also raised concerns over traffic counts within the Police data and the applicant's traffic survey, with the applicant's survey showing almost half the number of vehicular movements. The Highway Authority have assessed this data and comment that the Police data reveals odd results with very low flows in the AM peak, and also does not correspond to the Gladman traffic surveys also carried out recently. Officers are therefore faced with a discrepancy between Police data and developers' data in relation to traffic counts. However, this proposal is for only 8 dwellings, which would not normally require any form of Transport Statement or traffic count to be submitted. The applicant estimates that the development will result in 6 vehicle trips in the AM peak and 5 in the PM peak. The proposal will ultimately only

have a minimal impact on overall traffic flows in the vicinity of the site, and will not cause harm to highway capacity.

- 10.23 In response to this objection the developer comments that the purpose of the traffic survey carried out in July 2015 was to understand vehicle speeds, not vehicle numbers. It was acknowledged that vehicle numbers would be lower and not representative due to its being the summer holidays. The results were therefore not used to support the conclusions drawn in the Transport Assessment. The traffic survey data referenced by the Parish Council is 9 years old and cannot be regarded as representative of existing conditions. Comparison of speed data shows the developer's results to be broadly in line with the Police data.
- 10.24 The Parish Council have also raised concerns over the anticipated vehicular trip generation of the development, suggesting that the Transport Statement underestimates expected vehicle trips. The developer has confirmed that a comprehensive TRICS assessment has been carried out, and that vehicle ownership does not directly translate to vehicle usage. Following consultation with the Highway Authority, Officers are satisfied that an appropriate assessment has been made and that the development will not have a harmful impact on the highway network, capacity, or highway safety. It is also noted that there was no highway reason for refusal on the previous application for 10 dwellings, and that Gladman's appeal for up to 52 dwellings on land north of Green End was not dismissed on highway grounds.
- 10.25 The Highway Authority have raised no objection to the proposal on the grounds that the traffic impact will not be significant for the size of development proposed, and that adequate visibility is provided. Officers have no reason to disagree with these estimates and consider the proposal to be acceptable on highway grounds. However, Highways have commented that the proposed footway does not extend far enough to link up with the public footpath, and they recommend a condition to cover this point. A suitable turning facility will also be required within the site which could be controlled through a reserved matters application for layout. The new informal crossing will improve safety for pedestrians in this part of the village.
- 10.26 In terms of parking, there is adequate space proposed in the indicative layouts to provide for sufficient off-street car and cycle parking in accordance with the Council's adopted standards.
- 10.27 As previously stated there is a public footpath that runs along the southern staggered boundary of the site with a stepped access to the B1368. The footpath runs adjacent to the fenced boundary of No. 21

Green End but there is currently no boundary treatment between the footpath and the application site. Concerns have been raised that the proposed development would create a poor amenity for footpath users with rear garden boundary treatments proposed too close to the footpath. A footpath width of 4 metres has been requested by the Highway Authority, Public Rights of Way Service, and the Ramblers Association, with a further 1 metre vegetated buffer adjacent to the rear boundary fences. Officers consider this requirement to be excessive in comparison to other existing and new public rights of way in the area. Officers do not consider it reasonable to require a 4 metre strip of the application site to be turned over for an existing footpath. However, it is accepted that harsh rear boundary treatments would have an impact on the amenity of footpath users and therefore regard will be had to rear boundary treatments, including some planting on the side of the footpath, in any reserved matters application.

- 10.28 A new footpath is also now proposed towards the south of the site to connect Footpath 001 with the development site and the B1368. This would provide level access to the existing footpath which currently comprises of steps to the B1368. This new path also provides the only pedestrian access to the site given the reduced width and simplified design of the vehicular access. The path is considered to be suitably located to provide convenient access to the village and would provide a benefit for existing residents.

Scale and Design

- 10.29 Although the application is in outline form, an indicative layout plan and parameters drawing have again been submitted to indicate how the development could be achieved on site. The proposed access is now proposed towards the north of the site on the eastern boundary with dwellings positioned to face onto the access road as it curves round to the west of the site. The previous scheme proposed dwellings fronting onto a central access road, and that layout was considered to be more appropriate to the eastern side of Green End and the B1368, rather than the western side of Green End where the site is situated. The existing pattern of development on the western side of the road is characterised by loose detached dwellings that are either set back from the highway, or positioned adjacent to the highway on level ground. This amended scheme re-positions the dwellings further back from the road with a well-landscaped buffer to the highway, and therefore comprises a looser form of development that is set back and more characteristic of the western side of Green End. Officers are therefore satisfied that the indicative layout and density of the site would be appropriate and not harmful to the character of the area.

- 10.30 The re-positioning of the dwellings further west in the site has enabled a more generous frontage to the street that is to be landscaped and partly used as an informal play area. This would not be equipped, and there is no requirement for its provision given that less than 10 units are proposed. Nonetheless it would provide informal space for residents to meet and play, and full details would be secured through a reserved matters application. Concerns regarding the proximity of this play area to the B1368 are noted, but suitable screening can be achieved through condition.
- 10.31 The Conservation Officer has raised concerns regarding the layout and suggested that a better design could be achieved by utilising the existing farm access to the north of the site. This access does not however fall within the application site and is therefore not a feasible option. Officers also consider that this would result in a more detached form of development with access away from the village. It has also been suggested that new buildings should address the street and create more of a frontage. However, this would exacerbate the visual impact of the development in the street and Conservation Area, hence the development has been set back further into the site.
- 10.32 A number of concerns have again been raised in relation to the levels difference on site, which rises up to 8 metres above road level. Insufficient information was submitted with the previous application to demonstrate the treatment of these levels. However more detailed section drawings have been submitted with this application, and demonstrate that the dwellings can be set well back from the street frontage and not appear unduly prominent in the street. Subject to a condition to control building heights as previously discussed in this report, Officers are now satisfied that a development of up to 8 houses can be accommodated on this site without causing undue harm to the character and appearance of the area. Full details of the new dwellings will be assessed through a reserved matters application.

Impact on Heritage Assets

- 10.33 The frontage of the site, approximately 15 metres, lies within the Braughing Conservation Area wherein Local Plan policy BH6 requires new developments to be sympathetic in scale and siting in relation to the character of the area, and to respect landscape features and important views that contribute to the character of the area. The previous application was refused on the grounds that the physical alterations to the frontage, including removal of the hedge, and provision of a wide central access road with steep engineered banks,

would be harmful to the setting of the Conservation Area. Insufficient information was also submitted on levels. Following the previous refusal Officers have had pre-application discussions with the applicant and considered amended options. The scheme now proposed is the result of those discussions which has addressed both the Landscape and Conservation Officer's concerns. Although the existing hedge is now to be removed, it is not of a high quality and a replacement 'instant hedge' will secure a rapid alternative. The Conservation Officer has removed his objection and Officers are now satisfied that no harm would arise to the significance or setting of the Conservation Area. The proposal would therefore comply with policy BH6 and Section 11 of the NPPF.

- 10.34 There are no listed buildings within the immediate vicinity of the site – the nearest are located approximately 60m south of the site. The development will therefore have no impact on their setting.
- 10.35 In terms of archaeology, the Historic Environment Unit have commented that development of the site would be likely to impact on heritage assets of archaeological importance given the location of the site and findings on other nearby development sites. A condition to require a programme of archaeological work would therefore be considered reasonable and necessary.

Residential Amenity

- 10.36 The nearest neighbour to the site is Ravenscroft (shown on the submitted drawings as Birch House), located approximately 8 metres from the southern boundary. This dwelling has ground and first floor bedroom windows that face out across the site, and therefore any development would need to retain an adequate distance to prevent harmful overlooking or loss of light/outlook. Ravenscroft is positioned on lower land levels and Officers have visited this neighbouring dwelling to assess the impact. The indicative plans show new houses backing onto this neighbour at a distance of approximately 20 metres. Given the current open aspect from these bedrooms windows, and the lower land levels, there will clearly be some impact on the outlook from these windows, and some impact on privacy. However, 20 metres is a standard back-to-back distance and Officers remain satisfied that an acceptable relationship can be maintained between buildings based on the indicative layout drawing submitted. A condition to restrict the height of Plots 3 and 4 from 11 metres to 8 metres would also serve to reduce any impact. The impact is therefore not considered to be significantly detrimental to neighbouring amenity.
- 10.37 No. 21 Green End is located to the southeast of the site but, given the

difference in land levels, vegetation screening, and distance from the site, Officers are satisfied that no harm would arise to their amenity.

- 10.38 There are also a number of dwellings on the opposite side of the road at the Pound Close development which will face the site, and a number of concerns have been raised over potential overshadowing, overlooking, and overbearing from the new development. Whilst Officers acknowledge the difference in land levels, these neighbours are considered to be located at an adequate distance so as not to be harmed by the proposal. The indicative layout shows that the buildings have been set well back into the site, and therefore a distance of over 50 metres would be maintained.
- 10.39 In terms of the amenity of future occupiers Officers are satisfied that a layout could be achieved on site that would provide for an acceptable relationship between dwellings, with an appropriate level of external and internal amenity space.

Affordable Housing

- 10.40 The site lies just outside the village boundary where Officers consider the application of policy HSG3 to be appropriate to ensure a socially sustainable form of development. Given the site area, this triggers the need for 40% affordable housing, equating to 3 dwellings. The applicant proposes 3 affordable units and this therefore weighs in favour of the scheme. The exact scale and layout of the affordable units has not been identified but could be reasonably controlled through a reserved matters application. The Council's Housing Officer has raised no objection and comments that the tenure of the 3 units should be split 75% rent and 25% shared ownership. It is recommended that the provision of affordable housing be secured by condition to ensure appropriate delivery.

Ecology

- 10.41 An updated ecological survey has been carried out and again concludes that the site is of limited ecological value, and there are no statutorily protected wildlife sites within close proximity of the site. A previous badger survey found no sign of badger setts on site. In terms of bats, the trees have been surveyed but none of the existing trees exhibit any characteristics associated with roosting bats. Although bats are known to use linear landscapes for commuting and foraging, the treelines and scrub are connected to the wider landscape and the development will not have a significant impact on bat activity. Finally, a reptile survey was previously carried out which found no evidence of

reptiles other than juvenile toads. The 2015 walkover survey has confirmed that the habitats have not changed significantly since the 2013 surveys. No objection has been raised by the Wildlife Trust, Herts Ecology or Natural England, subject to a condition to secure ecological protection and enhancement.

Drainage

- 10.42 The site lies in floodzone 1 and therefore in an area of low flood risk. A Surface Water Drainage Statement has again been submitted which demonstrates that surface water runoff will be attenuated on-site up to a 1 in 100 year storm rainfall, with a 30% allowance for climate change, and released off-site via infiltration. The developer proposes an element of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) including permeable paving, geocell storage and infiltration.
- 10.43 The Council's Engineers again comment that the development will increase the amount of impermeable area on site, and that the proposed drainage system would be medium to poor quality SuDS, and the geocell tank would require a specialist maintenance programme. The drainage proposals also offer little water quality improvements or wildlife/biodiversity provision. Officers accept that the drainage scheme could be designed to be more sustainable; however the submitted drainage report identifies that the scheme will not increase the level of flood risk, and the drainage infrastructure would be maintained by a management company throughout the lifetime of the development.
- 10.44 Officers are also mindful that full drainage strategies are not normally required for developments of less than 10 dwellings, and this scheme now proposes only up to 8. Officers are therefore satisfied that an acceptable drainage scheme could be achieved on site, and that this could be reasonably controlled by condition given the local flooding and drainage issues identified by local residents. The previous application was not refused on drainage grounds and it is not recommended as a reason for refusal in this case.

Planning Obligations

- 10.45 Given that the proposal is now for up to 8 dwellings, it is not reasonable to request any financial contributions – this is only required for developments of 10 or more dwellings as set out in the Council's Planning Obligations SPD. The Council has no evidence of any need for lower threshold contributions towards village facilities.

Other Matters

- 10.46 Environmental Health have requested that a land contamination report be submitted and approved through a planning condition. This is considered to be reasonable and necessary given the former arable use of the land and potential for agricultural contaminants.
- 10.47 The proposal will not result in the loss of any high quality agricultural land.

11.0 Conclusion

- 11.1 In summary Officers acknowledge that the site lies outside the defined settlement boundary and within the Rural Area beyond the Green Belt wherein the proposed development would be contrary to policy GBC3. However, given the Council's lack of a 5 year housing supply, the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in paragraph 14 of the NPPF applies. Officers consider that the proposal amounts to a sustainable form of development and therefore permission should be forthcoming unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, or if specific policies in the NPPF indicate that development should be restricted.
- 11.2 Overall Officers consider that the scheme has been significantly improved since the previous refusal through a reduction in the number of units, a relocation of the dwellings further west and away from the highway frontage, relocation of the vehicular access further north with provision of a new detached footway, and a less engineered approach to the frontage. The submission of more detailed section drawings also indicates how the access arrangements can now be achieved without appearing overly engineered or opening up wide views into the development site to the detriment of the character of the area. Although the frontage hedgerow is now to be removed entirely, it is to be replaced with an instant hedge of native species which will provide instant screening and will soon mature to ensure that the character of this part of the village is maintained. Both the Conservation and Landscape Officers have now removed their objections, and Officers therefore consider the previous reason for refusal to have been overcome.
- 11.3 Although the development and frontage alterations, and elevated land levels, will inevitably have some impact, it is no longer considered that this results in harm that significantly and demonstrably outweighs the benefits of the scheme. The benefits include a contribution to the

Council's housing supply, which must be given substantial weight in accordance with the NPPF, provision of affordable housing, some economic benefit through construction and contribution to the local economy, social benefit through supporting community infrastructure and services, an informal play area, and level pedestrian access to Footpath 1 with a dropped tactile kerb crossing.

- 11.4 The application is therefore recommended for approval subject to the conditions set out below.

Conditions:

1. Outline permission time limit (1T03)
2. Details of the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale (hereinafter called 'the reserved matters') shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development begins and the development shall be carried out as approved.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Article 5 of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

3. Approved Plans (2E10)
4. Affordable Housing (5U12 – insert 40%)
5. Levels (2E05)
6. Programme of archaeological work (2E02)
7. Contaminated land survey and remediation (2E33)
8. Materials arising from demolition (2E32)
9. Surface water drainage shall be carried out prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted in accordance with the submitted Surface Water Design Statement (WSP, July 2015) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure appropriate surface water drainage in accordance with policy ENV21 of the East Herts Local Plan Second Review April 2007.

10. Tree/hedge retention and protection (4P05)

11. Prior to the commencement of development, the access and junction arrangements, and visibility splays shown on drawing 0899-GA-005 A rev D shall be completed in accordance with the approved plans and constructed to the specification of the Highway Authority, and an on-site turning facility shall be provided for HGV vehicles in accordance with a plan that shall first be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure safe and convenient access and egress for all road users.

12. Wheel washing facilities (3V25)

13. Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, the existing vehicular access shall be closed and the kerb reinstated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

14. The proposed footway shall be extended along the B1368 as a surfaced link to connect with the existing public right of way (Braughing Footpath 001).

Reason: To provide a safe link to the existing public right of way network.

15. No development shall take place until an ecological mitigation and management plan that is based on the submitted ecological report (PJC Ecology, August 2015) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include, but is not limited to, the following:

- a. Purpose and conservation objectives for the proposed works;
- b. Detailed designs and/or working methods necessary to achieve these objectives (including, where relevant the type and source of materials to be used, the provenance of native trees etc.)
- c. Extent and location of proposed works shown on appropriate scale plans;
- d. Timetable for implementation, demonstrating that works are aligned with the proposed phasing of development;
- e. Persons responsible for implementing the works;
- f. Details of initial aftercare and long-term maintenance.

The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and all features shall be retained in that manner thereafter.

Reason: To ensure no net loss of biodiversity from this development in accordance with Section 11 of the NPPF.

16. The ridge heights of the development hereby approved shall be limited to a maximum of 8 metres above existing ground level, measured adjacent to each building.

Reason: To limit the impact of the development on higher land levels on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and wider landscape in accordance with policies ENV1 and GBC14 of the East Herts Local Plan Second Review April 2007.

Informatives:

1. Other Legislation (01OL)
2. The applicant is advised of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 relating to the control of noise on construction and demolition sites. In connection with all site demolition, site preparation and construction works, no noisy work shall be carried out on site outside of the following hours: 07.30-18.30 on Monday to Friday, 07.30-13.00 on Saturday, and at no time on Sundays and Bank Holidays.
3. Unsuspected contamination (33UC)
4. The applicant is advised that in order to comply with conditions of this permission it will be necessary for the developer to enter into an agreement with Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 to ensure satisfactory completion of the associated off-site highway improvements. The applicant is advised to contact the Highway Authority at County Hall, Pegs Lane, Hertford, SG13 8DN (Tel: 0300 123 4047) to obtain the requirements on the procedure prior to the commencement of development.
5. The applicant is advised that the storage of materials associated with this development should not extend into the public highway without prior authorisation from the Highway Authority.
6. It is an offence under Section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 for any person, without lawful authority or excuse, to wilfully obstruct the free passage along a highway or public right of way. If this development is

likely to result in the public highway or public right of way network becoming routinely blocked the applicant must first contact the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements. Further information is available from the Highway Authority.

7. It is an offence under Section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or debris on the public highway, and Section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the party responsible. Further information is available from the Highway Authority.

Summary of Reasons for Decision

East Herts Council has considered the applicant's proposal in a positive and proactive manner with regard to the policies of the Development Plan (Minerals Local Plan, Waste Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD 2012 and the 'saved' policies of the East Herts Local Plan Second Review April 2007); the National Planning Policy Framework and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. The balance of the considerations having regard to those policies, and the amendments made since 3/14/0094/OP, is that permission should be granted.

KEY DATA**Residential Development**

Residential density	11 units/Ha	
	Bed spaces	Number of units
Number of existing units demolished		0
Number of new flat units	1	0
	2	0
	3	0
Number of new house units	1	Unknown at this stage
	2	Unknown at this stage
	3	Unknown at this stage
	4+	Unknown at this stage
Total		Up to 8

Affordable Housing

Number of units	Percentage
3	37.5%

Non-Residential Development

Use Type	Floorspace (sqm)
-	-

Residential Vehicle Parking Provision

Current Parking Policy Maximum Standards (EHDC 2007 Local Plan)

Parking Zone	4	
Residential unit size (bed spaces)	Spaces per unit	Spaces required
1	1.25	Unknown at this stage
2	1.50	Unknown at this stage
3	2.25	Unknown at this stage
4+	3.00	Unknown at this stage
Total required		Unknown at this stage
Proposed provision		Unknown at this stage

Emerging Parking Standards (endorsed at District Plan Panel 19 March 2015)

Parking Zone	4	
Residential unit size (bed spaces)	Spaces per unit	Spaces required
1	1.50	Unknown at this stage
2	2.00	Unknown at this stage
3	2.50	Unknown at this stage
4+	3.00	Unknown at this stage
Total required		Unknown at this stage
Accessibility reduction		
Resulting requirement		Unknown at this stage
Proposed provision		Unknown at this stage