


Reference: 16/00032/OUT

Date submitted: 14.01.16

Applicant: Davidsons Developments Ltd and Mr K & Mrs R Eggleston

Location: Land off Sand Pit Lane, Long Clawson

Proposal: Residential development of up to 55 dwellings, together with new areas of public open space ,access, landscaping and drainage infrastructure.



Proposal :-

This application seeks outline planning permission for up to 55 dwellings with associated public open space, landscaping and drainage. The details of the access have been submitted for approval at this stage, all other details would be subject to a separate reserved matters application .

The land falls outside of the village envelope for Long Clawson and is considered to be an edge of village location. Access to the site is proposed directly from Sand Pit Lane.

It is considered that the main issues arising from this proposal are:

- **Compliance or otherwise with the Development Plan and the NPPF**
- **Impact upon the character of the area**
- **Impact upon heritage assets**
- **Drainage/flooding issues**
- **Highway safety**
- **Impact upon residential amenities**
- **Sustainable development**
- **The role of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan and Local Plan**

The application is supported by a Design and Access Statement ,Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, Flood Risk and Drainage Assessment, Landscape and Visual Assessment ,Arboricultural Survey, Ecological

Assessment, Archaeology and Heritage, Agricultural Land Quality ,Ground Conditions ,Utilities Study and Consultation Statement . All of these are available for inspection.

The application is required to be presented to the Committee due to the level of public interest.

History:-

No relevant history

Planning Policies:-

Melton Local Plan (saved policies):

Policy OS2 - This policy restricts development including housing outside of town/village envelopes. In the context of this proposal, this policy could be seen to be restricting the supply of housing. Therefore and based upon the advice contained in the NPPF, **Policy OS2 should be considered out of date when considering the supply of new housing.**

Policy OS3: The Council will impose conditions on planning permissions or seek to enter into a legal agreement with an applicant under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the provision of infrastructure which is necessary to serve the proposed development.

Policy BE1 - allows for new buildings subject to criteria including buildings designed to harmonise with surroundings, no adverse impact on amenities of neighbouring properties, adequate space around and between buildings, adequate open space provided and satisfactory access and parking provision.

Policy H10: planning permission will not be granted for residential development unless adequate amenity space is provided within the site in accordance with standards contained in Appendix 5 (requires developments of 10 or more dwellings to incorporate public amenity space for passive recreation with 5% of the gross development site area set aside for this purpose).

Policy C1: states that planning permission will not be granted for development which would result in the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land, (Grades 1, 2 and 3a), unless the following criteria are met: there is an overriding need for the development; there are no suitable sites for the development within existing developed areas; the proposal is on land of the lowest practicable grade.

Policy C13: states that planning permission will not be granted if the development adversely affects a designated SSSI or NNR, local Nature Reserve or site of ecological interest, site of geological interest unless there is an overriding need for the development.

Policy C15: states that planning permission will not be granted for development which would have an adverse effect on the habitat of wildlife species protected by law unless no other site is suitable for the development Policy C16.

The National Planning Policy Framework introduces a ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’ meaning:

- approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and
- where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out -of- date, granting permission 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.

The NPPF offers direction on the relative weight of the content in comparison to existing Local Plan policy and advises that whilst the NPPF does not automatically render older policies obsolete, where they are in conflict, the NPPF should prevail.

It also establishes 12 planning principles against which proposals should be judged. Relevant to this application are those to:

- proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs.
- always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings;
- recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside
- promote mixed use developments, and encourage multi benefits from the use of land in urban and rural areas, recognising that some open land can perform many functions (such as for wildlife, recreation, flood risk mitigation)
- actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable.
- Take account of the different roles and characters of different areas, promoting the vitality of urban areas, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and support thriving rural communities.

On Specific issues it advises:

Promoting sustainable transport

- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people
- Development should be located and designed (where practical) to give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements, and have access to high quality public transport facilities.
- Create safe and secure layouts which minimise conflicts between traffic and cyclists or pedestrians
- Consider the needs of people with disabilities by all modes of transport.

Delivering a Wide choice of High Quality Homes

- Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
- LPA's should identify land for 5 years housing supply plus 5% (20% if there is a history of under delivery). In the absence of a 5 year supply housing policies should be considered to be out of date.
- deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities
- identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand

Require Good Design

- Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people.
- Planning decisions should address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment.

Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

- In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.
- Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.
- Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of or damage to a heritage asset the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision.
- In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

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

- 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. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.
- Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.

Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

- Encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value
- Aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity by taking opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments

This National Planning Policy Framework does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. Proposed development that accords with an up-to-date Local Plan should be approved and proposed development that conflicts should be refused unless other material considerations indicate otherwise. (NPPF para. 12)

Consultations:

Consultation reply	Assessment of Head of Regulatory Services
<p>Highways Authority: No objection, subject to conditions and developer contributions</p> <p><u>Off-Site Implications</u></p> <p>Following discussions with the applicants, a solution to the concern about the turning traffic at the junction of Sand Pit Lane and Back Lane has been put forward in the form of a mini-roundabout with provision of traffic calming on the approaches. The LHA are happy with this, however any final scheme will need to be the subject of detailed design and a Road Safety Audit.</p> <p>Whilst there has been local concern about the volume of traffic that would be likely to be generated by the proposal, particularly as it travels through the village centre, in the peak hours the volume of additional traffic that passes through the village would not be so high as to be able to demonstrate severe harm. It is considered that the predicted traffic flows may be a little low, given the characteristics of the site when compared to the ones used in the TRICS</p>	<p>The application seeks outline consent for a development of up to 55 dwellings. The only matter for detailed consideration is the access into the site. Layout, scale of development, matters relating to appearance (design) and landscape would form a reserved matters application should approval be granted.</p> <p>It is proposed to take the access off Sand Pit Lane with a series of roads and private driveways serving a development with a mixture of housing types.</p> <p>The submitted evidence indicates that there is sufficient capacity in the highway network to accommodate the traffic generated by this development. Off-site works are necessary to help safely manage turning traffic at the Sand Pit Lane and Back Lane junction.</p> <p>The Highway Authority has no objection to the access from Sand Pit Lane subject to off-site improvements and a contribution to encourage the new residents to use public transport.</p>

<p>interrogation, however even with slightly higher flows the traffic generation is unlikely to be severe. As such the LHA do not consider that it could justify a reason for refusal on the grounds of capacity.</p> <p>The proposals include some minor alterations to the carriageway and footway on Sand Pit Lane, to provide a minimum carriageway width of 5.5 metres and provide a suitable footway provision from the site towards the village. These works will need to be subject to a detailed design check and a road safety audit and will need to be completed prior to the first occupation of any dwelling.</p> <p><u>Transport Sustainability</u></p> <p>In terms of transport sustainability Long Clawson does have a number of local amenities including a school, shops, doctors surgery, public houses, village hall and employment opportunities. It also has a reasonable bus service. Therefore the site can be considered to be sustainable in transport terms, where future occupants would not be heavily reliant on the use of a private motor car for their journeys.</p> <p><u>Conditions</u></p> <p>Proposes standard conditions and notes, plus conditions to ensure the off -site provision of a mini-roundabout and traffic calming.</p>	
<p>Severn Trent Water Authority: No objection subject to conditions requiring details of foul and surface water disposal.</p>	<p>Noted – condition proposed</p>
<p>Environment Agency</p> <p>No comment – consultation should be directed to the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA).</p>	<p>Noted – see LLFA comments below.</p>
<p>Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) - Acceptable subject to conditions</p> <p>The LLFA consider that the proposed development will be acceptable if the following planning conditions are attached to any planning permission:</p> <p><u>Surface Water</u></p> <p>No development approved by this planning permission shall take place until such time as a surface water drainage scheme has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.</p> <p>The scheme shall include the utilisation of holding sustainable drainage techniques with the incorporation of sufficient treatment trains to maintain or improve the existing water quality; the limitation of surface water run-off to equivalent greenfield rates; the ability to accommodate surface water run-off on-site up to the critical 1 in 100 year event plus an appropriate allowance for</p>	<p>The applicant’s Flood Risk and Drainage Strategy confirms that the site is located in Flood Risk 1 and is not at risk from flooding.</p> <p>The proposed development includes areas of storm water balancing within the proposed open space on the northern part of the site. This will ensure that surface water run-off from the site can be satisfactorily accommodated.</p>

climate change, based upon the submission of drainage calculations; and the responsibility for the future maintenance of drainage features.

The scheme shall be fully implemented and subsequently maintained, in accordance with the timing and phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the local planning authority.

Full details for the drainage proposal should be supplied, including but not limited to, headwall details, pipe protection details (e.g. trash screens), long sections and full model scenarios for the 1 in 1, 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 year + climate change. Where discharging to a sewer, this should be modelled as surcharged for all events above the 1 in 30 year, to account for the design standards of the public sewers.

Watercourse

No development approved by this planning permission shall take place until such time as a detailed assessment or hydraulic model of the watercourse has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.

The currently proposed layout indicates that there are a number of structures including residential properties located in close proximity to the watercourse on the eastern boundary of the site. Whilst the site is located within Flood Zone 1 the watercourse is unlikely to have been modelled due to the size of the catchment and therefore represents an unknown risk.

The watercourse assessment should identify the capacity within watercourse channel, the inflows for the 1 in 1 year, 1 in 30 year and 1 in 100 year + climate change allowance (20% for watercourse assessments)

Watercourse Maintenance

No development approved by this planning permission shall take place until such time as a detailed assessment of the access requirements for watercourse maintenance has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.

As land owner and riparian owner of the watercourse, there are certain responsibilities for watercourse maintenance; this responsibility will be passed on to the plot/ land owners adjacent to the watercourse, the introduction of permanent features adjacent to the watercourse has the potential to prevent access for the appropriate equipment to maintain the watercourse and

increase the flood risk to the site.

Information for LPA and Applicant

FRA Details

The LLFA note that flood risk to the site has been discounted from all sources due to the sites location in Flood Zone 1, this is incorrect, Flood zone only relate to flooding from rivers. In addition the storage methodology, is not an approved approach for calculating storage requirements, the LLFA would like to see the storage estimated through the Wallingford Procedure, Microdrainage software or other appropriate system.

However the LLFA are not aware of any other sources of flood risk to the site and are willing to accept the drainage principles behind the proposal.

Additional Advice in response to Addendum

In response, the LLFA considers that the development would be acceptable subject to conditions.

The suggested conditions are (in summary) :

1. Submission and approval of details of surface water drainage ,including SuDS to ensure no increase in discharge rates
2. Management of surface water during construction on site.
3. Maintenance of SuDS .
4. Need to assess capacity of water course along eastern boundary at detailed stage.
5. Detailed layout needs to include access for maintenance of watercourses/ditches.

Response of LLFA to further representations:

- The LLFA acknowledge that the storage calculations are high level and lack the detail to ensure an appropriate design for all storm durations .It is noted that the application is for outline permission and a number of elements would be subject to variation . Consequently ,a condition is recommended that a detailed drainage design is submitted at the appropriate stage of development .
- Note that the IH124 methodology is not the preferred calculation ,but it is an acceptable method for this type of catchment .
- The methodology will overestimate the peak flows due to the values used, but the lack of permeable areas being included is an overestimate. Because this is an outline application gardens have not been included in the storage volumes ,the discharge rate would be a greenfield rate. This would only occur within larger rainfall events and are unlikely to exceed the equivalent rainfall event

Addendum to Flood Risk Assessment

The applicant's have submitted an addendum seeking to address two main objections :

- The adverse impact on the historic manor farmhouse pond and the likelihood of it drying out or suffering pollution
- The likelihood of the proposed SuDS drainage scheme diverting water to an adjacent catchment and causing flooding problems elsewhere in the village.

This report uses a topographical survey to assess the existing natural contours to understand the flow of water across the site and where it currently drains to and from . A model was then applied to calculate the existing greenfield run off rate entering and leaving the pond and two watercourses which serve the site. These are the historic pond to the north of the site; the ditch adjacent to Sandpit Lane and the ditch to the north-west of the site.

In summary ,the addendum concludes that increase in runoff calculated from the site will need to be mitigated with on site attenuation ,as on site testing has confirmed that infiltration techniques would be unsuitable . (Note – On sites where soil drains well and the water table is low enough stormwater infiltration can be the easiest means of managing runoff .Water percolates naturally into the subsoil, rather than being held in and discharged from attenuation features)) . The addendum recommends that :

- The existing ditch adjacent to Sandpit Lane and the ditch to the north-west of the site are cleared of overgrown vegetation and regularly maintained

<p>discharge. A check could be incorporated at the detailed stage to ensure that sufficient freeboard is included in the design to allow for this garden discharge.</p> <p>The conditions requested by the LLFA enable urban creep to be accounted for at the detailed stage .</p> <p>A 40% sensitivity would be expected on the detailed design to account for the new climate change guidance .</p> <p>Drain down times can be assessed as part of the detailed design, but the ponds would only be required to half drain within 24 hours.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussions be held at detailed design and adoption stages with the LLFA and the local water utility company to allow installation of flow controls for the three parts of the site which drain into the pond or two water courses. • All runoff will pass through SuDS features. Development runoff would be mitigated by the inclusion of filter drains or swales which collect water and transfer it to attenuation facility to discharge via a flow chamber to one of the adjacent water courses or the pond.
<p>Affordable Housing</p> <p>This application offers a 37% affordable housing contribution.</p> <p>The tenure mix would be 40% affordable rent (8 units) and 60% discount for sale (11 units) . The notional total mix of dwelling sizes which are proposed at this stage is eight 2 bed units; six 3 bed units and five 4 bed units. While the tenure mix is not the preferred proportion of rented and discount for sale ,which is usually 70% or 80% affordable rented, it would provide a total of fourteen 2 and 3 bedroom units, which the council’s recent Housing Needs Survey identifies as the size of affordable unit most needed in the Long Clawson area. This is a reasonable compromise in this instance.</p>	<p>This is an outline application which allows the details of the housing mix to be considered later, but a condition is suggested to ensure that a mixed balance of dwellings is provided.</p> <p>Saved policy H7 of the Melton Local Plan requires affordable provision ‘on the basis of need’ and this is currently 37%. This proportion has been calculated under the same processes and procedures which have previously set the threshold and contribution requirements for affordable housing within the Melton Borough.</p> <p>Due to the overriding need to provide permanent additional accommodation at Long Clawson C of E Primary School (see below and Item 3 of this Agenda , ‘Common Issues’) the associated exceptional costs, the tenure mix of affordable housing which is proposed in this case is considered to be acceptable</p>
<p>Historic England – The proposal will be harmful to the significance of designated assets commensurate with less than substantial harm as identified in the NPPF.</p> <p>The development is on land within the setting of a number of designated heritage assets. These are the scheduled moated site ,thought to be the site of a manor house north of the application site;the 14th century grade II* St Remigius church ;the grade II* Manor Farmhouse on West End;the grade II Vicarage and the Long Clawson Conservation Area all to the south of the site.</p> <p>The Manor Farmhouse was built between 1580 and 1620 for Richard ,the second son of Sir Henry Hastings, Sheriff of Leicester. It’s more than special historic and architectural interest in a national context is recognised through its grade II* listing and significance is clearly explained within the detailed list description. The application site</p>	<p>Paragraph 134 of the NPPF advises that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. This authority must undertake this balancing exercise in the determination of this application.</p> <p>Following receipt of Historic England’s comments the applicants produced a supplementary report in addition to their Heritage Assessment & Archaeological Assessment and Geophysical Survey Report.</p> <p>This also seeks to respond to the very detailed objections of the owner of the grade II* Manor Farmhouse. This objection also refers to an historic boundary feature which could be affected by the development .</p> <p>The original report considered that the development would not harm the setting or overall significance of the Old Vicarage ,the neighbouring scheduled monument or the</p>

forms part of the open countryside surrounding and on approaching the historic medieval and post medieval core of the settlement.

Historic England concludes that the proposals will diminish the appreciation and understanding of the rural context of the highly graded assets, in particular the grade II* listed Church, Manor Farmhouse and the conservation area. HE state that the proposal will be harmful to the significance of designated heritage assets commensurate with less than substantial harm as identified by the NPPF.

With regards to a prospect of a mini roundabout at the junction it is advised:

The amendments relate to the addition of a mini-roundabout at the bottom of Sandpit lane. The site lies within the conservation area and within the setting of the Grade II* listed Manor Farmhouse, Grade II* listed Church of St Remigius and SM moated site NE of the church. We refer to our previous advice dated 5 February 2016 where we stated the proposed development will be harmful to this collection of designated heritage assets. The addition of the mini roundabout does not change this view. Though a mini roundabout will not necessarily have any greater impact than another form of junction, this will depend on how it is designed and to ensure it does not stray beyond the existing highway. If the outline planning application is approved, **we strongly recommend the highways layout is conditioned. In this sensitive area, it will be important that the design is not overtly urban and respects the rural nature of the townscape.**

character or appearance of the conservation area. This report accepted that the development would have some impact upon the setting of the Manor Farmhouse and St Remigius Church, but with limited harm falling short of the substantial harm threshold referred to in the NPPF.

The applicants Heritage Statement provides a detailed description of the setting of these assets. It notes that while the development would be seen in the context of views towards and from the rear of the Manorhouse it is not part of any designed landscape setting. The proposal includes the retention of a public open space at the northern end of the site. The applicant's contention that this would ameliorate the impact of the development upon some views is accepted.

The development is also proposed to be laid out with viewing corridors within the site. While this is only an outline application the reserved matters could be designed to preserve key views.

The application site has had some historic association with the Manorhouse and may have been in shared ownership. But it was probably outside the curtilage of the Manorhouse and the applicant's statement that the development of the land would not detract from the significance of this property as a recognisable high status house seems to be logical.

It should be noted that the connectivity of the Manor Farmhouse to its rural setting has been compromised by the recent development of the Keystones and housing development within Old Manor Farm cul-de-sac with Ashfield House very close to the grade II* listed building.

The development would have an impact upon wider views of St Remigius Church and its relationship with this group of historic buildings. Although the church is some distance from the application site.

Once again, the proposed undeveloped corridor through the site is designed to maintain views and limit the impact of the new housing.

The northern boundary of the site abuts the Long Clawson Conservation Area. The proposed open space would separate the main development from the conservation area and would reduce its impact.

On balance it is considered that the development would not cause significant harm the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

With regard to the neighbour's historic boundary

	<p>feature it is difficult to precisely establish its origins or alignment . However, it is clear that this feature lies outside the main development area and is unlikely to be affected by the development.</p> <p>The neighbour's final objection is that development could cut the supply of water to their historic fishpond. The applicant's Flood Risk Assessment ,which included a visual assessment and digging trial pits, provided no evidence of springs or groundwater which could be affected by the development. There is no evidence to the contrary .</p> <p>With regard to the roundabout, it would be contained within exiting Highways boundaries and comprise only of road markings. Conditions requiring a detailed design could be applied in accordance with HE advice.</p>
<p>LCC Ecology – No objection, subject to conditions securing mitigation.</p> <p>The ecology surveys submitted with the application (Middlemarch Environmental, December 2015 – January 2016) recorded the application site to comprise species-poor semi-improved grassland, surrounded by hedgerows. No evidence of protected species were recorded on site, but a small population of great crested newts (GCN) were recorded in the pond to the north of the site.</p> <p>The proposed development will retain the GCN pond and the current proposed layout (Drawing No LC/SK01/OPT1) includes an area of open space and proposed balancing ponds to the northern end of the site. We welcome the layout of the northern end of the site as it provides a buffer between the development and the GCN pond and, provided it is adequately planted and managed, will help to mitigate for the loss of terrestrial GCN habitat on site. The proposed GCN mitigation strategy (Middlemarch, January 2016) is satisfactory in principle, but I am concerned that the development has the potential to 'trap' GCN in the area surrounding the pond. The proposed layout shows some open space to the eastern (Sand Pit Lane) boundary of the site for about 2/3 of the length of the site. However, there does not appear to be a suitable buffer in the lower 1/3.</p> <p>Requests that :</p> <p>Clarification of the buffer running north to south to allow connectivity between the existing pond to the north and the wider countryside. This will</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The application was accompanied by a habitats survey that discovered the presence of no protected species or suitable habitats except for a small population of GCN in the pond in the northern part of the site. This can be addressed by mitigation .</p> <p>The proposal provides an opportunity to provide net biodiversity gains through enhancements within the landscaping. While this is an outline application it is clear that buffer zones could be provided to enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>This has not been pursued as this is an application for outline planning permission . There is scope to address these points at the reserved matters stage when a detailed layout would be produced.</p>

<p>enable GCN to migrate.</p> <p>The layout is amended to reflect a buffer (above) for GCN and a buffer of the existing hedgerows.</p> <p>Conditions</p> <p>Should the LPA grant permission, we would recommend that the following are incorporated into a condition(s) of the development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Works to be in accordance with the recommendations detailed in section 6 of the Preliminary Ecological Assessment (Middlemarch Environmental, January 2016). 2.GCN mitigation (subject to slight amendments discussed above) to be followed (Middlemarch Environmental, January 2016). 3.All landscaping should be agreed with the LPA. The landscaping and design of the area to the north should be designed in accordance with the recommendations in the GCN Mitigation Strategy. 4.A Biodiversity Management Plan should be submitted prior to the commencement of the works. <p>Note - Protected species surveys are only considered to be valid for 2 years. Updated GCN and badger surveys will therefore be required, prior to any works (including clearance) on site if the works have not commenced before March 2017.</p>	<p>Mitigation measures have been proposed and a condition can be imposed to safeguard the on-site presence of Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>The Ecology report has been independently assessed and raises no objection from the County Council Ecologist subject to securing mitigation as proposed.</p>
<p>LCC Archaeology: Recommend that any planning permission be granted subject to the planning conditions, to safeguard any important archaeological remains potentially present.</p> <p>The Leicestershire and Rutland Historic Environment Record (HER) together with appraisal of the submitted desk-based assessment and geophysical survey (Trigpoint Conservation & Planning Dec 2015), indicates that the development site lies in an area on uncertain archaeological potential. It is therefore advised that the applicant should be required to make provision for an appropriate programme of staged archaeological mitigation secured by condition on any planning approval.</p> <p>Whilst no known archaeological remains have been recorded as yet within the development area, it is situated immediately adjacent to the historic settlement core of Long Clawson, to south of the Grade II* listed Manor Farmhouse and fish pond .</p> <p>Three conditions are proposed, relating to :</p>	<p>There is no objection on archaeological grounds.</p> <p>There is a need for additional work which can be controlled by conditions.</p>

<p>1) No demolition/development shall take place/commence until a programme of archaeological work, informed by an initial phase of trial trenching, has been detailed within a Written Scheme of Investigation, submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording (including the initial trial trenching, assessment of results and preparation of an appropriate mitigation scheme) • The programme for post-investigation assessment • Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording • Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation • Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation • Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation. <p>2) No demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (1).</p> <p>3) The development shall not be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (1) and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.</p>	
<p>Developer Contributions : Police</p> <p>A primary issue for Leicestershire Police is to ensure that the development makes adequate provision for the future Policing needs that it will generate. Leicestershire Police have adopted a policy to seek developer contributions to ensure that existing levels of service can be maintained as this growth takes place. They have taken account of the CIL tests and recent case law.</p> <p>Summary of contribution requested</p> <p>The police contribution request considers the amount and type of development proposed and compares this with existing Policing demand and crime information for the beat and neighbourhood policing area in which it will be situated. The</p>	<p>It is noted that the addition of up to 55 dwellings would have some impact on policing within the Borough.</p> <p>It is considered that these contributions relate appropriately to the development in terms of their nature and scale, and as such are appropriate matters for an agreement.</p>

<p>existing deployment of Police assets to police the locality are identified to forecast the impact of this individual development. The funding and capacity position of the Force is defined. NPPF and local Policy supporting a Policing contribution are identified. Commitments are made to manage the contribution. Finally the contribution is itemised as below with individual methodologies applied to identify a series of infrastructure projects necessitated by this development. CIL tests of compliance are applied to these.</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Start up equipment</td> <td>£2116</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vehicles</td> <td>£1307</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Additional radio call capacity</td> <td>£102</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PND additions</td> <td>£66</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Additional call handling</td> <td>£234</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ANPR</td> <td>£2055</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mobile CCTV</td> <td>£375</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Additional premises</td> <td>£14082</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hub equipment</td> <td>£110</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>£20,447</td> </tr> </table> <p>A full copy of the Polices request for developer contributions can be viewed at the Council Offices.</p>	Start up equipment	£2116	Vehicles	£1307	Additional radio call capacity	£102	PND additions	£66	Additional call handling	£234	ANPR	£2055	Mobile CCTV	£375	Additional premises	£14082	Hub equipment	£110	Total	£20,447	
Start up equipment	£2116																				
Vehicles	£1307																				
Additional radio call capacity	£102																				
PND additions	£66																				
Additional call handling	£234																				
ANPR	£2055																				
Mobile CCTV	£375																				
Additional premises	£14082																				
Hub equipment	£110																				
Total	£20,447																				
<p>Provision and maintenance of open spaces, including play areas</p>	<p>Details to be agreed and may need to be subject to a Section 106.</p>																				
<p>Developer Contributions: LCC</p> <p>Waste - The County Council has reviewed the proposed development and consider there would be an impact on the delivery of Civic Amenity waste facilities within the local area because of a development of this scale, type and size. As such a developer contribution is required of £4546 (to the nearest pound).</p> <p>The contribution is required in light of the proposed development and was determined by assessing which Civic Amenity Site the residents of the new development are likely to use and the likely demand and pressure a development of this scale and size will have on the existing local Civic Amenity facilities. The increased need would not exist but for the proposed development. The nearest Civic Amenity Site to the proposed development is located at Melton Mowbray and residents of the proposed development are likely to use this site.</p> <p>The existing Civic Amenity Site serves a large number of households, the level of the amount</p>	<p>The County Council consider the Civic Amenity contribution is justified and necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms because of the policies referred to and the additional demands that would be placed on the key infrastructure as a result of the proposed development. It is directly related to the development because the contributions are to be used for the purpose of providing the additional capacity at the nearest Civic Amenity Site (Melton Mowbray) to the proposed development.</p> <p>S106 payments are governed by Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations and require them to be necessary to allow the development to proceed, related to the development, to be for planning purposes, and reasonable in all other respects.</p> <p>It is considered that the waste contributions relate appropriately to the development in terms of their nature and scale, and as such are appropriate matters for an agreement and comply with CIL Reg. 122.</p>																				

reflects the proportional impact of the contribution and is therefore likely to be pooled but for the particular (Melton Mowbray) Civic Amenity Site which would serve the proposed development.

The developer contribution would be used on project reference MEL004 at the Melton Civic Amenity Site. Project MEL004 will increase the capacity of the Civic Amenity Site at Melton by:-

- New open topped containers.

There are no other known obligations from other approved developments, since April 2010, that affect the Melton Civic Amenity Site which may also be used to fund project MEL004.

Libraries –The County Council consider the proposed development is of a scale and size which would have an impact on the delivery of library facilities within the local area.

The proposed development on Melton Road, Long Clawson is within 8km Melton Mowbray Library on Wilton Road, being the nearest local library facility which would serve the development site. The library facilities contribution would be **£1,660** (rounded up to the nearest £10). It will impact on local library services in respect of additional pressures on the availability of local library facilities. The contribution is sought for materials, e.g. books, audio books, newspapers and periodicals etc for loan and reference use to account for additional use from the proposed development.

Education

The site falls within the catchment area of Long Clawson C of E Primary School. The School has a net capacity of 105 and 119 pupils are projected on the roll should this development proceed; a deficit of 14 places of which 3 are existing and 14 are created by this development.

There are no other primary schools within a two mile walking distance of the development. A claim for an education contribution is therefore justified.

The Authority has recently commissioned a feasibility study into the options to extend the school and a scheme has been designed and agreed with the school that will replace the mobile and extend the foundation stage room to provide the 30 additional places required to accommodate pupils from the proposed housing developments. This scheme will provide a maximum of 30 places and due to the constrained nature of the school site, it will

It is not clear how the requests relate to improvements at the library. As no explanation has been provided. It is therefore found that the request is not compliant with CIL Reg. 122 in this instance as the improvements would not be relevant to this specific development or necessary.

The contributions requested for mitigation against waste and libraries are a tariffed style requests that will be ‘pooled’. Under CIL Reg. 123(3) no more than five contributions can be pooled for any singular infrastructure project. The request for improvements to the civic amenity site has been allocated to a specific project and will provide new open top containers that will increase the capacity at the site. It is therefore considered appropriate for inclusion in a S106 agreement.

Long Clawson village school is already over capacity and this development would increase the deficit by a further 14 places.

As explained, the LEA has developed an approach to expanding the school and identified costs (see opposite). However, the quantity the development should contribute is dependent upon the total number of houses proposed within its catchment, which is unknown until applications are determined. **Please see additional detail in the ‘Common Issues’ report forming Item 3 of this agenda.**

It is considered that the request is proportionate with the proposed development and is considered to be necessary and specific to the increase population the proposal would bring and is therefore considered compliant with CIL Regulation 122.

mean that when complete further expansion of the school will not be possible.

The total cost of the proposed scheme is £1,080,094, of which the LA will meet any costs associated with the replacement of the mobile classroom estimated to be £280,000. The balance of the cost (£800,094) will need to be met through S106 contributions from those developments given planning permission in the village. The cost will be apportioned to the development based on the number of dwellings given planning permission. Unfortunately the size of the school site means that there is only capacity to provide for an additional 30 places and nothing more.)

The contribution for a development of 55 dwellings will be £333,921. This is based on sharing the costs between 127 dwellings.

Secondary Education

The site falls within the catchment area of Bottesford Belvoir High School. The School has a net capacity of 650 and 602 pupils are projected on the roll should this development proceed; a surplus of a 48 pupil places after taking into account the 10 pupils generated by this development.

An education contribution will therefore not be requested for this sector.

Highways

To comply with Government guidance in the NPPF, the CIL Regulations 2011, and the County Council's Local Transport Plan 3, the following contributions would be required in the interests of encouraging sustainable travel to and from the site, achieving modal shift targets, and reducing car use.

Travel Packs; to inform new residents from first occupation what sustainable travel choices are in the surrounding area (can be supplied by LCC at **£52.85 per pack**).

6 month bus passes (2 application forms to be included in Travel Packs and funded by the developer); to encourage new residents to use bus services, to establish changes in travel behaviour from first occupation and promote usage of sustainable travel modes other than the car (can be supplied through LCC at (average) **£350 per pass** (NOTE it is very unlikely that a development will get 100% take-up of passes, 25% is considered to be a high take-up rate).

New/Improvements to 2 nearest bus stops (including raised and dropped kerbs to allow level access); to support modern bus fleets with

The s106 requests for sustainable transport are considered to comply with CIL Regs. 122 and 123 in that they are necessary and related directly to the application and can be included in an Agreement if permission is granted.

<p>low floor capabilities. At £3263 per stop. Information display cases at 2 nearest bus stops; to inform new residents of the nearest bus services in the area. At £120 per display. Bus shelters at 2 nearest bus stops; to provide high quality and attractive public transport facilities to encourage modal shift. At £4908 per shelter.</p> <p>Long Clawson Village Hall and Recreation Ground Ltd</p> <p>Requests are submitted for a series of projects as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Car Park Drainage and Surface • Pre School Extension to existing Village Hall • Pavilion and Changing Room Facilities • 3 Years - Outside Maintenance of Recreation Ground, Play Area, MUGA, Walkways • Outside Toilet • Cycle Rack <p>The sums have been calculated on the basis of the proportionate increase that the development would add to the demand on the facility based on the current level of housing in Long Clawson, and amount to a total of approx. £34,000 for this proposal, based on its scale (no. of houses).</p>	<p>The approach adopted by the Village Hall and Recreation ground management body is considered acceptable under the applicable CIL regulations as it relates directly to the scale of the development and the increased demand it would generate for the facility.</p> <p>The requests have been presented to the developers and their response will be reported verbally to the Committee.</p>
---	--

Representations:

A site notice was posted and neighbouring properties consulted. As a result **211 letters of objection have been received** . The majority of the objections are a 'pro forma' letter which has been signed by local residents .The remainder include a number of very detailed representations from close neighbours.

There is an objection from Clawson, Hose and Harby Parish Council which refers to all of the reasons which are summarised below. The Parish Council notes that in addition to the above it has received 33 letters of objection.

The PC highlight the need for a survey of drainage in the village and request that housing should be planned strategically across the three villages and not piecemeal, as services and infrastructure are shared.

Representations	Assessment of Head of Regulatory Services
<p>The 'pro forma' type letters in which residents have identified objections from a list of 10 reasons for opposing the application. These points also summarise the objections raised in many of the individual letters of representation and are listed below.</p>	<p>There is no prescription on how representations may be submitted and all need to be taken into account.</p>
<p>1.Large urban development out of character with the village, too large and in the wrong place.</p>	<p>This is a development of housing and associated infrastructure which will change the appearance and character of this field. It has been designed to respect this setting and should integrate successfully into this part of the village. It is an acceptable scale and density of development of this site.</p> <p>This is the only application for consideration and the merits of possible other sites is not relevant .</p>

	<p>A more detailed assessment of the impact of the development upon heritage assets and the character of the landscape are addressed elsewhere in this report.</p>
<p>2.Adverse impact upon conservation area, historic core of the village, open views and heritage and rural aspect of the Church ,Manor Farmhouse, Manor Farmhouse Pond ,Castle Field and the cemetery .</p>	<p>There will be some impact upon heritage assets. This is assessed in detail in the commentary on Historic England’s representations earlier in this report. Paragraph 134 of the NPPF advises that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.</p> <p>These impacts are required to be balanced against public benefits as required by NPPF para 134. These include the provision of housing, including affordable housing, employment in construction and various developer contributions.</p>
<p>3.Not sustainable, village infrastructure unable to cope with a large influx of extra people</p>	<p>Long Clawson has a wide range of services and facilities and whilst limited, public transport links to other locations.. In the evidence compiled towards producing the Local Plan it had the 3rd best range of facilities of all of the villages in Melton Borough.</p> <p>The developer has agreed to pay all of the contributions which have been requested to mitigate the impact of the proposal upon local infrastructure.</p>
<p>4. School is at capacity and cannot cope with more pupils and has no room to expand.</p>	<p>See Education Authority comments above and item 3 of this agenda ‘Common Issues’. The LEA has devised a means by which the school can be extended to accommodate demand from this development as per the expectation of this extract of NPPF para 72</p>
<p>5.Doctor’s surgery is almost full and unable to cope with population increase.</p>	<p>This point is being examined in more detail, but it is understood that there is capacity to accommodate this development. The surgery is currently displaying that it can accept new patients.</p>
<p>6.Road through the village is inadequate ,narrow winding lane with 14 right-angled bends.</p>	<p>Concerns about the adequacy of the local road network are understood. However ,there is no technical evidence to support these concerns and subject to mitigation the Highway Authority has no objection to the development.</p> <p>There is no evidence of serious accident ‘blackspots’ in the village associated with the road configuration.</p>
<p>7.Traffic and parking at the Sands and East End is often at standstill . More traffic will exacerbate this –it is unsustainable.</p>	<p>Like many rural centres, with older housing having little or no off-street parking, there is limited capacity for parking on the street, particularly in the village centre.</p> <p>This development would be self sufficient in terms of off-street parking and would have little impact upon the existing situation.</p>

	<p>There is no evidence that the volume of traffic generated by this site would have a significant impact upon the overall movement of traffic through and within the village. The development would increase the traffic on the local highway network. However there is no evidence of serious accidents in the area likely to be affected, nor of excessive congestion in terms of journey times etc</p>
<p>8.Limited bus service. Will continue to be mostly dependent upon car. Increased commuters on lanes contrary to Government policy for sustainability and low carbon environment.</p>	<p>There is a bus service which is relatively limited. This development would promote and subsidise the use of public transport and would help to sustain existing provision.</p>
<p>9.Threatens water supply to village pond and water run off will lead to flooding.</p>	<p>The LLFA do not object to the proposal. They have assessed the applicant's Flood Risk Assessment .They also respond to complaints about flooding ,such as occurred earlier this year ,and have not expressed any concerns about drainage or flooding.</p> <p>The possible impact upon the pond has been addressed above ,in the assessment of the impact of the development on heritage assets.</p>
<p>10. Contrary to the wishes of local people ,developer led and not part of a reasoned and consulted plan.</p>	<p>The volume of representations which have been received is an indication of local opposition. The frustration with development proposals coming forwards in advance of Local or Neighbourhood Plans is shared and understood by the Planning Authority.</p> <p>The NP is a significant consideration in this application. This addressed in greater detail below and the weight it carries in Item 3 of this agenda 'Common Issues'.</p>
<p>Adverse impact upon landscape</p> <p>This is tranquil landscape of high to medium sensitivity to residential development . The proposed houses on the rising scarp slope would be prominent and at odds with the linear character of the village.</p> <p>Development should small scale and respect the setting of the historic landscape ,including heritage assets.</p>	<p>The applicants have produced a detailed Landscape and Visual Assessment study. This follows accepted professional methodologies and takes account of relevant policies and this Council's <i>Areas of Separation ,Settlement Fringe and Local Green Space Study</i> which has been produced to support the emerging local plan.</p> <p>This is a relatively sensitive site for residential development as identified in the Council's study.</p> <p>It is not subject to any landscape or heritage designation which would prohibit its development (such as AONB, Green Belt, Local Green Space etc) .</p> <p>While the appearance of the site would be altered, it is considered this would not have a significant impact upon the wider landscape and the setting of the village.</p> <p>Layout and landscaping could help assimilate</p>

	<p>the scheme into the landscape. Housing on this site would not appear to be alien or unusual in this location.</p> <p>Impact upon heritage assets is addressed above.</p>
Loss of agricultural land	The land is not good grade agricultural land (grade 3b) and is undeveloped pasture land. Planning policies seek to develop brown field sites over greenfield but does not prohibit development on greenfield land.
Impact upon Ecology/Conservation The site is a haven for wildlife, particularly the Manorhouse pond. Adverse impact upon flora and fauna.	It is acknowledged that the site is of ecological interest . The information submitted by the applicant has been independently assessed and considered to be satisfactory subject to conditions and mitigation.
Impact upon Policing and Community Safety	There will be some impact and this is addressed by the contribution which the developer has agreed to pay to the Police.
Neighbourhood and Local plans <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is a need for a holistic plan for the development in the village before any schemes go forward, taking into account facilities, drainage and the needs of businesses - The application should not be determined until there is a Neighbourhood Plan 	The NP is a significant consideration in this application. This addressed in greater detail below and the weight it carries in Item 3 of this agenda 'Common Issues'.
Housing need and mix There is demand for bungalows and downsizing properties.	The development will provide a mix of housing capable of helping to meet local needs.
<p>Drainage and Flooding Many concerns have been raised about the adequacy of the drainage system, and that it will exacerbate problems already experienced in the village because of the age and quality of the drainage system.</p> <p>With specific reference to the scheme submitted. Local residents submitted a report which outlined shortcomings in the applicant's addendum to their FRA.</p> <p>The report considers that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate detail, especially of storage volumes and maintenance ,pollution control,filtration and down-stream flood risk and the impact on the Old manor House pond; • Basic errors in calculations due to different calculation methods used; • The use of outdated and inappropriate methods for assessing greenfield runoff and climate change resulting in misleading calculations 	<p>The design proposes to intercept water on the site in attenuation ponds and released only when the receiving water course has capacity. This would ensure it is released at a rate no greater than it current undeveloped condition. However such systems are required to be constructed as capable of accommodating a 1:100 rainfall event plus 'headroom' capacity for climate change and as such will be able to reduce the quantity of water entering the watercourse than occurs naturally.</p> <p>The response of the LLFA to the residents report is reported on page 7 above.</p>

Other Material Considerations, not raised through representations:

Consideration	Assessment of Head of Regulatory Services
<p>Planning Policies and compliance with the NPPF</p> <p>The application is required to be considered against the Local Plan and other material considerations.</p>	<p>The proposal is contrary to the local plan policy OS2 however as stated above the NPPF is a material consideration of some significance because of its commitment to boost housing growth.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that local housing policies will be considered out of date where the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year land supply and where proposals promote sustainable development objectives it should be supported. The Council cannot demonstrate a five year land supply and as such housing policies are deemed out of date.</p> <p>Several appeal decisions have confirmed that the Local Plan’s Village Envelope policy (OS2) is incompatible with the NPPF and therefore out of date, and therefore the NPPF should take precedence.</p> <p>However this <u>on its own</u> is not considered to weigh in favour of approving development where harm is identified, such as being located in an unsustainable location.</p> <p>The site is a greenfield site where there is no presumption in favour of development however the harm attributed by the development are required to be considered against the benefits of allowing the development in this location.</p> <p>The provision of up to 55 dwellings, including 37% affordable units with the house types that meet the identified housing needs is considered to offer public benefit that weighs in favour of allow development in this location. The proposal due to its site characteristics is not considered to unduly adversely affect the countryside due to its siting adjacent the built up area of the village. The proposal because of the density proposed and landscaping proposals, offering net biodiversity benefits, would seek to assimilate the development and respect nearby heritage assets.</p> <p>It is considered that development in this location would assist in boosting housing supply in a sustainable location.</p> <p>The land is not good grade agricultural land and is undeveloped pasture land. Planning policies seek to develop brown field sites over greenfield but does not prohibit development on greenfield.</p>
<p>The (new) Melton Local Plan – Pre submission version.</p>	

<p>The Pre Submission version (as amended by 'Focussed Changes') was submitted for Examination on 4th October 2017.</p> <p>Please see associated Item 3 of this agenda 'Common Issues' regarding the weight it should assign.</p> <p>The site is allocated in the Local Plan subject to the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>local educational capacity is available, or can be created through developer contributions, to meet the needs of the site.</i> • <i>drainage infrastructure is available to accommodate the surface water from these sites without causing or exacerbating flooding elsewhere</i> • <i>that substantial boundary landscaping and screening is provided and that all existing boundary hedges and trees are retained ;</i> • <i>An area of open space is included in the development to provide a buffer from the adjacent listed building to the north, to protect its setting;</i> • <i>A heritage assessment is provided with impacts assessed and suitable mitigation measures identified. This should pay particular attention to the effect of the development proposal on the Conservation Area, the setting of adjacent listed buildings and potential archaeological interests;</i> <p>Neighbourhood Plan The CHH Neighbourhood Plan has completed Examination and is proceeding to Referendum.</p> <p>Please see associated Item 3 of this agenda 'Common Issues' regarding the weight it should assign. The site is not allocated in the CHH NP for housing.</p> <p>The site is addressed by Policy ENV8; Protection Of Important Views - <i>Development proposals should respect the open views and vistas as shown in Figure 10 and Appendix 2 - Important Views in the Parish. Proposals which would have an unacceptably detrimental impact on these views and vistas will not be supported.</i></p>	<p>The proposal is in compliance with the emerging local plan which it is considered is a factor that weighs in favour of granting permission.</p> <p>The proposal is in conflict with the CHH Neighbourhood Plan. It is considered this non-compliance adds substantial weight against the proposal.</p>
---	---

Conclusion

It is considered that the application presents a balance of competing objectives and the Committee is invited to reconcile these in reaching its conclusion.

The Borough is deficient in terms of housing delivery and this would be partly addressed by the application. In terms of delivering houses it must be noted that the applicants are builders, who would be able to start to deliver new dwellings within the next five years, which is a significant material consideration.

Affordable housing provision remains one of the Council's key priorities. This application presents some affordable housing that helps to meet identified local needs. Accordingly, the application presents a vehicle for the delivery of affordable housing of the appropriate quantity, in proportion with the development and of a type to support the local market housing needs. Long Clawson is considered to be a sustainable location having access to employment, health care facilities, primary education, local shops, and a regular bus services. It is considered that there are material considerations that weigh in favour of the application.

There are a number of other positive benefits of the scheme which include developer contributions to mitigate impacts upon local services. There are also benefits arising from the proposed highways improvements.

It is considered that balanced against the positive elements are the site specific concerns raised in representations, particularly the development of the site from its green field state and impact on the character of the village, and concerns regarding traffic, impact upon heritage assets and impact upon drainage .

The Borough is considered to have a sufficient supply of deliverable housing sites in line with current planning guidance, with the most recent evidence pointing to more than seven years. Despite Long Clawson being considered a sustainable location for housing having access to various facilities, primary education, local shops, and a regular bus services and limited distances to employment opportunities which has reflected in its identification as a 'service centre' and is allocated for housing in the Emerging Local Plan as site 'LONG 4', **this is considered not to outweigh the policies within its Neighbourhood Plan which has 'passed' its Examination and commands significant weight (see Item 3 'Common Issues' of this agenda for greater detail).**

In conclusion it is considered that, on the balance of the issues, there benefits accruing from this proposal when assessed as required under the guidance in the NPPF in terms of housing supply and affordable housing in particular and the weight assigned to the Neighbourhood Plan do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

Recommendation: REFUSE, for the following reason:-

- 1. The application proposes a development of dwellings that is contrary to the Long Clawson Neighbourhood Plan. The development is allocated as a reserve site that should only be considered should demand for housing in the Borough shift or other allocated sites not come forward for development. The application is therefore contrary to Policies H1, H2 and H3 of the Clawson, Hose and Harby Neighbourhood Plan 2017 to 2036.**

Officer to contact: Mr J Worley

Date: 27th November 2017