

Application Ref: 15/01840/OUT

Proposal: Outline planning permission for up to 80 residential dwellings (including up to 30% affordable housing), introduction of structural planting and landscaping, informal open space and children's play area, surface water flood mitigation and attenuation, vehicular access from Uffington Road and associated ancillary works. All matters to be reserved with the exception of the main site access

Site: Land To The West Of, Uffington Road, Barnack, Stamford

Applicant: Gladman Developments Ltd

Agent:

Referred by: Director of Growth and Regeneration

Reason: In the wider public interest

Site visit: 16.11.2015

Case officer: Miss A McSherry

Telephone No. 01733 454416

E-Mail: amanda.mcsherry@peterborough.gov.uk

Recommendation: **REFUSE**

1 Description of the site and surroundings and Summary of the proposal

Site and surrounding area

The site covers an area of approximately 4.28 hectares. It is located in the open countryside, adjacent to the Limited Growth Village of Barnack. The site is currently used as an agricultural field. The site is bounded to the east by the recently completed 41 dwelling housing development of Paynes Field, which was an allocated housing site within the Village envelope. It is bounded to the south by the older housing development on Bainton Road. To the north and west the site there are agricultural fields. The site slopes downhill from south west to north east.

Proposal

Outline planning permission is sought for:-

- Up to 80 residential dwellings (including up to 30% affordable housing) on 2.58 hectares of the site giving a density of 31 dwellings per hectares,
- Introduction of structural planting and landscaping (a total 1.7 hectares of green infrastructure, including open space, wildlife area and LEAP play area),
- Informal open space and children's play area,
- Surface water flood mitigation and attenuation
- Vehicular access from Uffington Road, including road widening, new footpaths, and tree and hedgerow removal to facilitate the access.

Under this outline planning application all matters, with the exception of access, are reserved for future applications and consideration. Therefore Members are being asked to consider the principle of the proposed development, and the means of access to the site only.

2 Planning History

Reference	Proposal	Decision	Date
15/00009/SCREEN	Screening opinion for residential development of up to 85 dwellings	Comments	01/10/2015

3 Planning Policy

Decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan policies below, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Section 66 - General duty as respects listed buildings in exercise of planning functions

The Local Planning Authority has a statutory duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Section 72 - General duty as respects conservation areas in exercise of planning functions.

The Local Planning Authority has a statutory duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the Conservation Area or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

Section 4 - Assessment of Transport Implications

Development which generates a significant amount of traffic should be supported by a Transport Statement/Transport Assessment. It should be located to minimise the need to travel/to maximise the opportunities for sustainable travel and be supported by a Travel Plan. Large scale developments should include a mix of uses. A safe and suitable access should be provided and the transport network improved to mitigate the impact of the development.

Section 6 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Housing applications should be considered in this context. Policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if a 5 year supply of sites cannot be demonstrated.

Section 6 - Residential Development in the Open Countryside

Housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. New isolated homes in the open countryside should be resisted unless there are special circumstances.

Section 12 - Conservation of Heritage Assets

Account should be taken of the desirability of sustaining/enhancing heritage assets; the positive contribution that they can make to sustainable communities including economic viability; and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. When considering the impact of a new development great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

Planning permission should be refused for development which would lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance unless this is necessary to achieve public benefits that outweigh the harm/loss. In such cases all reasonable steps should be taken to ensure the new development will proceed after the harm/ loss has occurred.

Section 13 - Mineral Safeguarding

Non mineral development proposals should not normally be permitted in Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSAs) where they may constrain potential future use of the minerals.

Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011)

CS01 - Settlement Hierarchy and the Countryside

The location/ scale of new development should accord with the settlement hierarchy. Development in the countryside will be permitted only where key criteria are met.

CS02 - Spatial Strategy for the Location of Residential Development

Provision will be made for an additional 25 500 dwellings from April 2009 to March 2026 in strategic areas/allocations.

CS08 - Meeting Housing Needs

Promotes a mix of housing the provision of 30% affordable on sites of 15 or more dwellings (70% social rented and 30% intermediate housing), 20% life time homes and 2% wheelchair housing.

CS10 - Environment Capital

Development should make a clear contribution towards the Council's aspiration to become Environment Capital of the UK.

CS14 - Transport

Promotes a reduction in the need to travel, sustainable transport, the Council's UK Environment Capital aspirations and development which would improve the quality of environments for residents.

CS16 - Urban Design and the Public Realm

Design should be of high quality, appropriate to the site and area, improve the public realm, address vulnerability to crime, be accessible to all users and not result in any unacceptable impact upon the amenities of neighbouring residents.

CS17 - The Historic Environment

Development should protect, conserve and enhance the historic environment including non scheduled nationally important features and buildings of local importance.

CS19 - Open Space and Green Infrastructure

New residential development should make provision for/improve public green space, sports and play facilities. Loss of open space will only be permitted if no deficiency would result.

CS20 - Landscape Character

New development should be sensitive to the open countryside. Within the Landscape Character Areas development will only be permitted where specified criteria are met.

CS21 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation

Development should conserve and enhance biodiversity/ geological interests unless no alternative sites are available and there are demonstrable reasons for the development.

CS22 - Flood Risk

Development in Flood Zones 2 and 3 will only be permitted if specific criteria are met. Sustainable drainage systems should be used where appropriate.

Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Mineral and Waste Core Strategy DPD (2011)**CS26 - Mineral Safeguarding Areas**

Development will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the mineral concerned is no longer of economic value, the mineral can be extracted prior to development taking place, the development will not inhibit extraction in the future, there is an overriding need for the development and prior extraction cannot be reasonably undertaken or the development is not incompatible.

Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012)

PP01 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Applications which accord with policies in the Local Plan and other Development Plan Documents will be approved unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Where there are no relevant policies, the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

PP02 - Design Quality

Permission will only be granted for development which makes a positive contribution to the built and natural environment; does not have a detrimental effect on the character of the area; is sufficiently robust to withstand/adapt to climate change; and is designed for longevity.

PP03 - Impacts of New Development

Permission will not be granted for development which would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy, public and/or private green space or natural daylight; be overbearing or cause noise or other disturbance, odour or other pollution; fail to minimise opportunities for crime and disorder.

PP12 - The Transport Implications of Development

Permission will only be granted if appropriate provision has been made for safe access by all user groups and there would not be any unacceptable impact on the transportation network including highway safety.

PP14 - Open Space Standards

Residential development (within Use Classes C3 and C4) will be required to provide open space in accordance with the minimum standards. The type of on-site provision will depend on the nature and location of the development and the needs of the local area.

PP16 - The Landscaping and Biodiversity Implications of Development

Permission will only be granted for development which makes provision for the retention of trees and natural features which contribute significantly to the local landscape or biodiversity.

PP17 - Heritage Assets

Development which would affect a heritage asset will be required to preserve and enhance the significance of the asset or its setting. Development which would have detrimental impact will be refused unless there are overriding public benefits.

PP19 - Habitats and Species of Principal Importance

Permission will not be granted for development which would cause demonstrable harm to a habitat or species unless the need for, and benefits of it, outweigh the harm. Development likely to have an impact should include measures to maintain and, if possible, enhance the status of the habitat or species.

Peterborough Local Plan 2016 to 2036 (Preliminary Draft)

This document sets out the planning policies against which development will be assessed. It will bring together all the current Development Plan Documents into a single document. Consultation on this document runs from 15 January to 25 February 2016.

At this preliminary stage the policies cannot be afforded any weight with the exception of the calculation relating to the five year land supply as this is based upon the updated Housing Needs Assessment and sites which have planning permission or which are subject to a current application. Individual policies are not therefore referred to further in this report.

Planning practice guidance (PPG) – Department for Communities and Local Government (2014)

- Conserving and enhancing the historic environment
- Community Infrastructure Levy

- Design
- Natural Environment
- Travel plans, transport assessments and statements in decision-taking

Peterborough Design and Development in Selected Villages – Supplementary Planning Document – Adopted 13 June 2011

SPD Policy – Barnack & Pilsgate

B&P 1 Where new housing is proposed, these should be individual dwellings, or small groups of dwellings. The creation of larger housing estates is inappropriate.

B&P 2 Careful attention should be paid to the layout of new developments to reflect the character of the village.

B&P 3 It is important that spacing and density of new development does not appear out of place in relation to historic form and existing development nearby.

4 Consultations/Representations

PCC Transport & Engineering Services

No Objection – The additional information submitted has overcome our initial reasons for refusal and so there are now no objections subject to the imposition of conditions.

PCC Lead Local Drainage Authority

No Objection - The additional information submitted has overcome our initial objection. Therefore subject to the imposition of a condition requiring the details of the sustainable drainage scheme there are now no objections.

PCC Conservation Officer

Objection – The proposed development will result in change to the wider setting of the church from vantage points from the north and north west, however this change would not harm the setting of the church and its significance. The current application site makes a positive contribution to the landscape and rural setting of the village. The development site would be visible from Stamford Road, the northern edge of the conservation area. Views out to open countryside from the conservation area help contribute to the character of the nucleated village form, albeit eroded. A development of 80 units adjacent to Paynes Field estate would create a dense development that would be out of scale at a village edge location where the historic form would be expected to see a lower scale and less dense development. This would result in harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Therefore it is considered that the proposal would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the Barnack Conservation Area and not accord with Section 72(1), of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) and is not in accordance with Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and the National Planning Policy Framework (Heritage considerations). The harm caused would be less than substantial and in accordance with paragraph 134 and would need to be weighed against the wide public benefits arising from the proposal.

PCC Archaeological Officer

Objection – On the basis of the available evidence, the site has the potential to contain remains of all periods. If present, these remains are expected to survive in good conditions of preservation. Therefore a programme of archaeological work should be carried out pre-determination to include geophysical survey, aerial photographic appraisal and evaluation by trial trenching.

PCC Minerals And Waste Officer (Policy)

No Objection – The application site falls within two Mineral Safeguarding Areas, designated for deposits of sand and gravel and limestone, considered to be of current or future economic importance. The application initially failed to address Policy CS26 of the Minerals & Waste Core Strategy, which only allows development in limited circumstances. However a Mineral

Safeguarding Report (January 2016) was subsequently submitted which demonstrates that the mineral resources (including both sand and gravel and limestone) are not a viable economic resource. Therefore this objection has been overcome and it is considered that the proposal is in accordance with policy CS26 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy.

PCC Wildlife Officer

No objection – The submitted ecological appraisal has satisfactorily set out an appropriate habitat buffer and mitigation measures including fencing to protect badgers, these measures should be secured by condition. The report, in view of the history of reptiles in the area that were the subject of a translocation exercise, recommends precautionary measures. These are acceptable and should be secured by condition. There are no bat roosts present on site, however the site boundaries may be used for foraging/commuting bats. Therefore at reserved matters stage bat roosting features and appropriate lighting to minimise the impact on bats should be proposed. The removal of vegetation that might support birds should be done outside of the bird nesting season and a range of bird nesting features should be incorporated into the detailed scheme. It is not considered a detailed lizard survey would be required. The precautionary approach detailed in the ecology report in respect of any lizards that may be found on site is considered to be acceptable, and this could be secured by condition.

PCC Tree Officer

No objection - The loss of trees is likely to be limited and in my opinion there are feasible ways of protecting or construction close to retained trees. The loss of the 2 Ash trees to create the access is not ideal, but they are not good quality trees, therefore there would be no objection to their loss if it can be successfully justified. The creation of a boundary buffer strip to the west of the site is welcomed mitigation planting. The location of dwellings to the south of the site at reserved matters stage, will have to be sited outside of the shading arcs of the offsite trees to ensure acceptable residential amenity is achieved. At reserved matters stage a finalised Tree Protection Plan and an Arboricultural Method Statement to identify the exact Root Protection Area infringements and associated methodologies would be required to reduce any potential impact. In addition full and detailed landscape details would be required along with implementation and maintenance plans. Conditions recommended.

PCC Education & Childrens Dept - Planning & Development

No objection – The school has recently expanded its admission to 30, which gives an overall capacity of 210. At the Oct 2014 census, 1 in 3 pupils were from outside the catchment area, because the school has a good reputation locally and attracts out of catchment pupils. The school is popular and successful and not at risk of closure from low numbers. The development would likely to have a pupil yield of 25-30 primary age pupils, but they would arrive over a period of time and some might already be living in the catchment area. There may be issues if children are moving in during their primary career as some year groups are already full. However there is some capacity for expansion at the school and CIL money from the developer could be used towards this.

PCC Strategic Housing

No objection – In accordance with Policy CS8, 30% of the provision should be affordable housing. Therefore 24 affordable homes should be provided. Policy CS8 requires 20% of units to be built to lifetime homes standard, this would be 16 dwellings and 2% should be wheelchair housing, 2 dwellings.

Landscape Architect (Amey)

No objection – It is considered that that levels of landscape susceptibility to change, value and sensitivity has been underestimated in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). Effects on the character of the wider landscape are unlikely to result in unacceptable levels of harm, due to the site being relatively well-contained by topography. However effects on local landscape character are likely to be higher than predicted in the LVIA. It is considered that the effects at year 10 would remain adverse. The level of most of the adverse visual effects identified

could potentially be reduced with a well-designed locally appropriate and properly managed landscape scheme over time. However the development is unlikely to result in any visual improvements to the existing baseline situation.

Natural England

No objection – Subject to securing the 1.7hectares of green space on site, by condition or legal agreement, to reduce the visitor pressure from residents on the Barnack Hills and Holes Special Area of Conservation (SAC). This green space should incorporate characteristics such as mock limestone features, to create an attractive and interesting area of open space which is a genuine counter attraction to the SAC. Natural England requested the applicant carry out a visitor survey, to identify existing visitor pressures, and establish the likely additional pressure of this development however the applicant has said they are not willing to do this. In the absence of such a survey Natural England would be willing to accept a financial contribution towards suitable SAC management measures and to address the recreational pressures of the development, and offer suitable mitigation. This could include things such as dog bins, signage, community engagement and habitat protection measures. Therefore Natural England will remove its objection if a) an appropriate level of financial contribution to fund SAC management measures can be agreed and secured through and S106 legal agreement and b) details of onsite green infrastructure of 1.7 hectares can be agreed and secured by condition. Subject to securing these, it is considered the authority as a Competent Authority, could ascertain that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the SAC in accordance with the Conservation (of Habitats and Species) Regulation 2010 (as amended), and as such an appropriate assessment would not be required.

Wildlife Trust

No objection - There are a few errors in the ecological report regarding County Wildlife Sites (CWS). The Barnack Road Verges CWS, and Windmill Farm Meadow CWS were missed. The Barnack Grassland is approximately 0.25km away, not 0.4km. The Wildlife Trust agrees with the conclusions in the ecological report that should permission be granted and mitigation recommendations followed, there should be no significant negative impact on the CWSs.

We are concerned over the potential adverse impacts from increased recreational pressure on Barnack Hill and Holes SAC/SSSI/NNR as this is a sensitive site, which is already well-visited. As stated in the discretionary advice letter from Natural England, it is possible adverse impacts on this site could be avoided, **if** the proposed 1.7ha of green infrastructure (including 1.125ha of public open space and 0.41ha of ecological buffer area) is provided within the development site **and** this green infrastructure is designed and implemented to a standard which ensures it is an attractive alternative to Barnack Hills and Holes. The Wildlife Trust considers that the proposed 1.7ha of green infrastructure should be guaranteed as a minimum. The level of information provided with the current application is not sufficiently detailed to determine what the standard/quality of the green infrastructure design will be. Detailed designs and management proposals for the areas of green infrastructure will be required before the impacts can be fully assessed. If these do not achieve a sufficiently high standard which would ensure visitor pressure is directed away from Barnack Hills and Holes, then the Wildlife Trust would object to this development.

Police Architectural Liaison Officer (PALO)

No objections – In terms of Crime Prevention and Community Safety, no objections. I should be consulted again at the detailed reserved matters stage.

Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service

No objections – Adequate provision for fire hydrants should be secured by way of a condition or Section 106 legal agreement, the cost of which must be paid by the developer. Access and facilities for the Fire Service should be provided in accordance with the Building Regulations Approved Document B5, Section 16.

Environment Agency

No objection – Subject to the imposition of a condition in respect of the provision of mains foul sewage infrastructure on and off the site. The report submitted indicates that a direct connection to

the public foul network system is likely to have a detrimental effect on the existing sewerage network. Therefore further hydraulic modelling work is required to enable Anglian Water to provide a solution for draining the foul flows from the development. This needs to be carefully managed to ensure that there is no deterioration of a water body, in accordance with the Water Framework Directive.

Anglian Water Services Ltd

No objections – A condition in respect of foul drainage strategy is required. The surface water management does not relate to Anglian Water assets therefore we have no comments to make.

Historic England

No objections – No comments to make on this occasion.

Barnack Parish Council

Objection – (The full objection is 16 pages long, so Officers have summarised the comments below).

- Countryside location - Policy SA4 of the Site Allocations DPD, states that the purpose of a village envelope is to prevent the spread of development into the countryside and to maintain the character of each settlement. This policy states that land outside of the village envelope is countryside and as such development will be assessed against Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy. Policy CS1 states development in the countryside will be restricted to that which is demonstrably essential to the effective operational of local agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation, and access to natural greenspace, transport or utility services; and to residential development which satisfies the 'exception test' sets out in Policy CS8. The site and proposed development does not meet the exception test for 'affordable housing', in accordance with Policy CS8. The Barnack and Pilsgate Village Design Statement, produced in 2001 by the Parish Council states 'It is most important that the village building envelopes for Barnack and Pilsgate are retained and not enlarged for any reason.' Also the 2005 Barnack and Pilsgate Parish Plan states 'The Village envelopes of both Pilsgate and Barnack must be respected'. The proposed development is outside the village envelope and therefore contravenes the principles laid down in the Core Strategy and Site Allocations DPD, the Village Design Statement and Parish Plan. In the opinion of the Parish Council, the development would have a significant adverse urbanising effect on the village of Barnack.
- Scale of development - This housing development does not follow the settlement hierarchy in Policies CS1 and CS2 of the Core Strategy which is Peterborough city, then Key Service Centres, then Limited Growth Villages and then Small Villages. The Site Allocations DPD, identified site SA6.5 land west of Uffington Road in Barnack for 41 dwellings in Policy SA6. The scale of this development is far in excess of this adjacent allocation. The 41 dwellings in this adjacent allocation have been recently completed, 2 other new houses have been built and 3 are currently under construction in the village. Therefore the Parish Council maintains that Barnack as one of the smallest limited growth villages has already contributed its fair share towards the housing target. Barnack is an inappropriate location for this scale of development, the Key Service Villages would be much better placed to take this scale of development due to the services and facilities they offer. In the opinion of the Parish Council the villages infrastructure, facilities and services are inadequate to support a further large increase in what will inevitably be a young population, so the proposed development is unsustainable. It is understood that the Council using the revised 2015 OAN as a basis for its growth targets, will now be able to demonstrate it has a 5 year housing land supply. There is no evidence of need for a large new housing estate in Barnack.
- The Peterborough Design and Development in Selected Villages (2011) SPD, states 'individual or small groups of houses would be suitable for these village settlements. Larger housing estates would be entirely inappropriate.' The Parish Plan says 'growth and

development must be gradual.’ This proposal is therefore contrary to the Village Design Statement, the Parish Plan and Design and Development in Selected Villages SPD. It would increase the village to 480 dwellings, a sudden increase of dwellings of about 20%. This is over and above the already built out allocation of 41 dwellings in Paynes Field, which in itself was a 10% increase on the size of the Village. Growth would not be gradual if permission was granted for this development. The Parish Council after full consultation with residents consider, the development is directly opposed to the considered wishes of residents because it is outside of the village envelope, and a 20% increase in the number of dwellings is not considered to be limited growth.

- Minerals - The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste DPD, aims to avoid the sterilisation of minerals resources. The proposed development would unnecessarily sterilise mineral resources.
- Landscape impact - The SPD classifies the fields to the west of Uffington Road as part of an Area of Best Landscape. The proposed development site is in a prominent, elevated position with high landscape value, in sloping land at the edge of the village. It comprises productive arable farmland. The site abuts the new Paynes Field development and is visible from both Uffington Road and Stamford Road.
- Impact on the Conservation Area - The approach from the west, along Stamford Road, lies within the village Conservation Area. The introduction of 80 more new houses, in addition to the 41 in Paynes Field, would greatly alter the appearance of the western and northern approaches to the Conservation Village of Barnack, and detract from its rural character. We contend that adding large developments to small villages undermines their sense of identity and heritage, and has a direct and adverse impact on the village character. This is not the ‘right way to grow’. The Localism Act and Peterborough’s Rural Vision and Parish Charter (2015) recognises that rural areas and villages are an important asset.
- Traffic congestion and Highway safety - In particular, traffic on Uffington and Bainton Roads has already increased significantly as a result of the building of the Paynes Field estate. Traffic congestion, especially at the junction of Uffington Road and the B1443, and the danger to children walking to and from school area already of great concern to the village and further extensive development would greatly exacerbate these problems.
- Impact Barnack Hills and Holes - The Parish Council is of the view that the 1.7 hectares would not be enough open space for the resident’s recreational needs. Residents would be drawn to the nearby Barnack Hills and Holes National Nature Reserve, which is open to the public. This important grassland site is showing signs of overuse, especially by dog walkers. A widening network of paths and soil enrichment, cause by dog fouling, is leading to localised changes in the flora. The canine population could increase by 20% if this development proceeds, which would exacerbate the pressure of this nature site.
- Ecology - Despite the various safeguards suggested in the Ecological Appraisal, the proposed development is very likely to have a severe and permanent adverse impact on the badger colony. Mitigation and compensation measures, aimed at reducing disturbance and providing sufficient habitat to accommodate the badgers on completion of the development, are unlikely to be effective. There will be disturbance both during the construction phase and afterwards, from occupied houses and from pedestrians and dogs using the proposed new footpath, which would run close to the sett. A population of common lizard was present on the adjacent brownfield housing site Paynes Field. The lizards had to be captured and translocated before development commenced. The Ecological appraisal submitted did not include a detailed survey for lizards, as the site was considered to be of low value to reptiles. The Parish Council have consulted the Amphibian and Reptile Conservation Trust and who have advised in view of the history of the adjacent site there may be common lizards on site. It is not possible to verify this as the animals hibernate over the winter. Natural England and Defra recommend that reptile surveys are

carried out in April, May and September. The Parish Council requests that a full survey in the field margins and hedgerows is carried out to ascertain whether common lizards are present on site. If a population is found, adequate mitigation and compensation measures as recommended by Natural England and Defra are required.

- The Parish Council held a public meeting to discuss the proposal, residents were wholeheartedly against it, 100 or so people attending. The main objections were loss of village character, increase in traffic, inadequate infrastructure and facilities, and environmental damage. In the spirit of both the Localism Act and the Rural Vision and Parish Charter, it is vital that the Planning department takes the view of residents into account.

Ufford Parish Council

Objection – The Localism Act gives communities the right to contribute to planning decisions. The top priorities of Barnack and surrounding villages is to protect the village envelopes and protect the surrounding ‘open countryside’. Each village has its own identity and we do not want them to coalesce or become suburbs of Peterborough. Barnack is designated as a ‘low growth’ village in the Local Plan, and has already accommodated 46 houses in the past 5 years. An additional 20% in the number of houses is unacceptable. Barnack is known for its old stone houses and Hills and Holes National Nature Reserve, a well known beauty spot. This development would harm these attractions. Barnack is a ‘low growth’ village because of its few services, and residents depend on their cars for access to shops, work, secondary education and leisure activities. Another 80 houses would add another 150-200 cars and another 50-100 children of pre and primary school age. The existing services such as water and sewage systems are already in need of renewal. There would be an adverse effect on the surrounding countryside with its 2 stately homes (Burghley House and Walcot Hall), nature reserves, woods, walls, hedges and protected verges, farmers fields. Any development outside the village envelope is opposed because it would set a precedent.

Southorpe Parish Council

Objection – Barnack is a limited growth settlement and the site lies outside of the village envelope. The development would impact significantly on the rural character of Barnack, and set a precedent for excessive and inappropriate development for surrounding villages. This development would be contrary to the Design and Development in Selected Villages SPD (2011). The development would not be sustainable, there is very little facilities within the village. This increase in population would put an unacceptable strain on the rural road network, increasing road danger and changing the character of the area. A large development would detract from the rural character of the village, increase flood risk and impact on the fauna and flora of the site and surrounding area, of special landscape value. There is no evidence of demand for development of this scale in Barnack, and it is expected that the Council can deliver its 5 year housing land supply without resorting to rural sites outside of village envelopes.

Helpston Parish Council

Objection – We object to any unsuitable developments outside any Village envelopes, as this is contrary to the adopted Local Development Plan.

Civic Society

Objection – Strongly objects for the reasons set out in Barnack Parish Council’s letter of 7th December 2015.

Councillor D Over

No comments received

Shailesh Vara MP

Objection – The site is located in the open countryside, outside of the defined village envelope. This would result in loss of agricultural land and set a precedent for other large scale housing development outside villages in the area. Barnack is a Limited Growth Village, 80 dwellings would

be therefore not be of an appropriate scale for this village, increasing the existing housing stock by 18%. The site is in a Mineral preservation area, where development should only be approved in exceptional circumstances, there has been no demonstration on exceptionality. Uffington Road is a busy route, which has queuing traffic and problems due to on road parking. A further 80 dwellings will make this situation worse and create additional noise and hazards for pedestrians. There are limited amenities in the village and capacity issues would arise at the primary school and GP surgery. The woodland area proposed to the north of Linden Close has recently had a Tree Preservation Order imposed, the proposed pedestrian access through this area would disturb wildlife.

Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 34

Total number of responses: 97

Total number of objections: 97

Total number in support: 0

Objections have been received from 97 residents raising the following issues:-

- The land is a greenfield site that is designated open countryside, outside of the Village envelope. Therefore residential development is contrary to the Local Plan.
- Barnack is classified as a limited growth village, and this is an application for major development, this is not appropriate, and contrary to the Local Plan.
- This application appears to hinge on the number of years of housing land supply the Council has. The Council say 5.3 years and Gladman say 3.6 years, how will this be resolved and when.
- The adjacent Paynes Field which was redeveloped for housing, was a brownfield site, where housing previously existed, which is different to this site which is an agricultural field.
- I have lived in the village for 69 years and seen many new houses being built, all of which I consider have been an asset to the community. This application is not a natural infill to the village, it is too large, and too soon since the addition of adjacent 41 homes of Paynes Field, which was only completed in the last year.
- I am not opposed to growth, but feel it should be planned growth, within the Village envelope.
- The Village Design Statement (2001) and Peterborough Design and Development in Selected Villages Supplementary Planning (2011), states 'where new housing is proposed, these should be individual dwellings, or small groups of dwellings. The creation of larger housing estates is inappropriate. This development is contrary to this. The proposal is also contrary to the Parish Plan (2005).
- The proposed development is not in keeping with the grain of the village and the local vernacular. The adjacent Paynes Field development was of a far higher density than that of any other part of the Village and should not be replicated.
- The proposed green space on the site should be used to break up the density of housing, rather than screen the development from outside the site, as proposed.
- One entrance into the development is out of keeping with the village setting and is purely financial led.
- This large development is not sustainable and would alter entirely the character of Barnack as a rural Conservation Area.
- The development will result in the loss of agricultural land used to grow crops.
- The site is on the edge of the Conservation Area.
- The site is within an Area of Best Landscape.
- The village only contains 1 school, 1 pub and a post office, which the owners are trying to close down as it is not a viable business. The applicant might argue that these addition residents will help to support these existing facilities. However experience has shown from the building of 41 houses at Paynes Field adjacent to the site this has proved not to be the case, as the people who have moved in commute long distances to work and so don't use

local facilities.

- This development will increase the size of the Village by 20%, so we will expect a large increase in traffic, which the village roads will not be able to accommodate.
- Whilst Barnack can accommodate limited sustainable development within its envelope, surely the place to build bigger developments is in town and cities to reduce the travel times, costs and pollution created by people travelling to work and other activities.
- There are serious issues with the protection of the existing landscape surrounding the existing village, which this proposed development is in direct conflict with.
- The site is the first slope up from the Fens, therefore it will be very visible.
- Uffington Road already experiences heavy traffic at peak times and is used as a rat run, this additional traffic will make this situation worse. When the railway crossing is closed there will be an inevitable build up of traffic causing a further hazard.
- Uffington Road already has problems with people parking on either side of the road, which makes it difficult for cars to pass. This development will add to these problems.
- Uffington Road is never gritted in the winter, and adding all this additional traffic will make this road even more dangerous.
- I would dispute that the schools and GP surgeries will be able to accommodate the level of development proposed.
- There is a Tree Preservation Order on the woodland north of Linden Close, and there is a lot of wildlife in this woodland. The proposed pedestrian path through this woodland will harmfully affect the wildlife and trees and will reduce the privacy of properties whose gardens bound this land.
- The site is within a Minerals Safeguarding Area, which seeks to protect this Mineral resource.
- I was not prepared to get involved in the Gladman residents survey before the application was submitted, I think Gladman should undertake another consultation now the application is submitted.
- This development could set an unwelcome precedent for other similar developments in future.
- Have all other local villages taken their fair share of new housing? Have the surrounding Authorities of Lincolnshire, Rutland and Northamptonshire taken their fair share of new housing?
- I would question whether the main sewage system is able to cope with this development as it appears to be over capacity at present, judging by the frequency of blockages.
- For consistency if this site were to be developed it should be done by David Wilson Homes as they built the adjacent houses in Paynes Field.
- The amount of information submitted with the application is too much for non specialist individuals to understand and work with, and is beyond the capacity we have, even as a collection of villagers.
- Barnack school has 170 children. School Road at 8.45am is chaos, with mums dropping of children. Whilst it may be possible to add more school buildings, there is no way additional traffic can be accommodated.
- There are no jobs in Barnack to support this growth.
- Increase in noise levels.
- Harmful impact on the Barnack Hills and Holes Nature reserve.
- The creation of the woodland pedestrian path, will destroy natural habitat and force away wildlife that currently uses it. It will also cause damage to the protected trees. There are bat roost in this woodland that could be disturbed.
- The site is within an area of high archaeological significance, this development could result in the loss of damage of important buried remains.
- This does not constitute sustainable development.
- Harmful impact on the privacy of adjacent residential sites. Light pollution for neighbouring properties. Adverse impact on the quality of light of adjacent residents.
- The village has a poor bus service.
- Harmful visual impact on the countryside and the setting of the Village.
- The 2011 census identified the village had 432 dwellings. 45 have been built in the last 4

years, which is around a 10% growth. There is not capacity for additional large scale growth, as this is a Limited Growth Village. 80 further dwelling would be a further 20% increase.

- Traffic calming needed on Uffington Road.
- The traffic survey done is a year old and out of date, especially as it was carried out before the changes at Lolham, including the effects of the new one way system. Since then traffic numbers have increased.
- There has been a decline in hegehogs in this area, this development will make this situation worse. I understand the impact on badgers has not fully been assessed.
- The wider landownership of the applicant would allow the provision of a much safer access from Stanford Road.
- Have the applicant been requested to under an Environmental Impact Assessment, as this would add 25% to the existing housing provision?
- The adjacent Paynes Field development suffers from 1. Lack of resident and visitor parking, 2. Provision of adequate soft landscaping, limited footpath provision and lack of children's play area. This should not be allowed to be repeated on this site.
- The development will have a harmful impact on the surrounding landscape character.
- In future Barnack village could become like Deeping St James and Market Deeping which now appear to be overlapped as one small town rather than separate villages. This would not be acceptable.
- Many in the Village have to go to Stamford for a GP, this development will put further pressure on already stretched GP surgeries.
- There is no secondary school provision within the village, children will have to travel for secondary education.
- I live in the village but can't get my children into the Primary school and have to drive my children to school in Wittering.
- We were previous led to believe no houses would be built on this land, because it was a greenfield site outside of the Village Envelope.
- The residents in Paynes Field will loose their existing countryside views, which for many is the reason they bought these properties, knowing the land adjacent would not be built on, because it is in the countryside outside the Village boundary. There is a wildlife corridor at the rear of the existing properties.

5 Assessment of the planning issues

The main issues are:-

a) Principle of development

The application site is located in the open countryside, outside of the village envelope of the Limited Growth village of Barnack. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS1, which restricts development in the countryside to that which is essential to the effective operation of local agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and access to natural greenspace, transport or utility services.

In addition the proposal does not meet the exception test of Policy CS8, in terms of provision of affordable housing. The exception test would only be met if it was proposed to provide affordable housing above the required 30% policy requirement, to meet a specific and demonstrable local need, was of a number and type to meet this local need and the site in light of all other policies was suitable for residential development.

Therefore the principle of residential development on this site is not considered to be acceptable and is contrary to Policies CS1 and CS8 of the Core Strategy.

b) 5 Year Housing Land Supply

The NPPF paragraph 47, requires Local Planning Authorities to identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years worth of housing against their housing requirements.

The National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) states:-

‘Housing requirement figures in up-to-date adopted Local Plans should be used as the starting point for calculating the five year supply. Considerable weight should be given to the housing requirement figures in adopted Local Plans, which have successfully passed through the examination process, unless significant new evidence comes to light. It should be borne in mind that evidence which dates back several years, such as that drawn from revoked regional strategies, may not adequately reflect current needs’.

The Peterborough Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD) was adopted in 2011 and sets out the Council’s future housing requirements between 2009 and 2026. However the housing need figure is based on the now revoked Regional Spatial Strategy and therefore does not reflect current need, as more up to date evidence has been published.

The Preliminary Draft Local Plan (Jan 2016), which was out for public consultation in January and February 2016, uses updated housing requirement based on the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (October 2015).

On the 15th January 2016, Peterborough City Council published its 5 year Housing land supply document for 1 April 2016 – 31 March 2021, to support the preliminary Draft Local Plan (Jan 2016). This document supersedes the 5 year land supply document published in November 2015.

The housing need identified in the Preliminary Draft Local Plan is for 27,625 dwellings between 31 March 2011 and 1 April 2036, or 1,105 dwellings per year, therefore a 5 year requirement of 5,525 dwellings.

To meet the five year land supply requirements account must be taken of the completions between 1 April 2011 and 31 March 2015 compared against the annual requirement of 1,105 dwellings per year. Between 2011 and 2015 a total of 4,420 dwellings were required to be delivered. However, there was a shortfall in delivery of 702 dwellings over that period, therefore this ‘backlog’ should be accommodated for in the next five years.

An estimate of supply against requirements for the current year 2015/16 also needs to be factored in. It is estimated that 878 dwellings could be completed in the current year, which is a further shortfall of 227 dwellings compared with the 1,105 annual target. This increases the shortfall to 929 (702 +227) dwellings. This means that during the five year period 2016 to 2021 a total of 6,454 dwellings are required to meet the backlog. This represents an average of 1,291 dwellings per year.

However, once the five year requirement has been calculated the NPPF then requires local authorities to identify a five percent buffer to ensure choice and competition in the market, and where there has been a record of persistent under delivery of housing, this should be increased to twenty percent. It is made clear in the NPPF that this additional requirement is moved from further in the plan period and not an additional requirement for more housing.

Looking at the number of completions each year between 1 April 2009 and 31 March 2015 compared against the five year requirement for 1,105 dwellings per year, 2 of the 6 years exceeded the annual target. Therefore there is no evidence of persistent under delivery, and so the Council is only required to include a 5% buffer.

Therefore, to meet the requirement to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing land, the requirement between 2016 and 2021 is a total of 6,730 dwellings, this includes the 5% buffer, giving a requirement of 1,346 dwellings per year.

For the avoidance of doubt, the five percent buffer has not been applied to the backlog. To do so would result in a greater than five percent amount being brought forward from further in the plan period, and therefore would be contrary to national policy.

The Council have provided a list of the five year supply of deliverable housing sites, between 1 April 2016 and 31 March 2021.

The council has identified land that is capable of delivering 8,373 dwellings between 1 April 2016 and 31 March 2021. The five year requirement during this period is 6,730, so 1,643 additional dwellings more than the five year requirement can be provided. This equates to a 6.22 year supply, therefore the council can demonstrate a five year supply of housing land.

The applicant in their submission have calculated that the Council only has a 3.6 year housing land supply. This is because they used the 2014 figures. Since the application submission updated figures have been published by the Council which results in the applicant's calculation being incorrect. In the published 2014 figures the Liverpool method was used to calculate the 5 year supply, but subsequent appeal decisions and changes to government guidance, makes it clear the Sedgfield method of calculation should actually be used. Therefore the new 2015 figures detailed above are based on the Sedgfield method.

The City Council's 5 year housing land supply document dated 15th Jan 2016, demonstrates that the Council can demonstrate it has a deliverable 5 year supply of housing. Therefore in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraph 49, the policies of the adopted development plan are considered up to date and do not need to be set aside as per the NPPF in instances where authorities cannot demonstrate that they have sufficient land supply.

c) Size and scale of development

The Site Allocations DPD (2012), identified one housing allocation in the Barnack Village, this was SA6.5, a 1.76 hectare site for 41 dwellings. This site has been built out, and is now occupied. This was a brownfield site, within the village envelope, and is positioned adjacent to the application site. This is a relatively high density residential development of about 30 dwellings per hectare in comparison with the densities in the rest of the village, and is positioned on the edge of the village. However it follows the general linear pattern of development in the immediate vicinity and was a brownfield site. In comparison, this site is a larger piece of land 4.28 hectares which is currently an agricultural field, and of a greater depth, than the adjacent site and would provide approximately twice the number of dwellings up to 80. Development on the application site will be viewed in the context of the adjacent residential site, and the appearance of the village edge will change from this smaller housing development to a much larger housing estate. This will provide a further urbanising effect to the rural edge of the Village, which cumulatively will be visually harmful. It is considered both in visual terms and as a result of the service provision of the Limited Growth Village that the size and scale of the development proposed would be harmfully out of scale with the size and facilities of the adjacent village of Barnack. Policy B&P 1 states for new housing proposed within the village these should be individual dwellings or small groups of dwellings, and the creation of larger housing estates would be inappropriate. Therefore in line with this policy the Village can only accommodate small scale development. It is not considered a housing development of up to 80 dwellings immediately adjacent to the Village, could be considered acceptable, where there is a presumption against new housing in the countryside and where there is no demonstrable need for it.

It is therefore considered that the proposed development would be contrary to Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy, in terms of its countryside location and that the scale and size of the development and the cumulative impact with the existing Paynes Field development, would appear visually harmful and out of scale with the rural character of the village edge. It is also considered that such a large scale housing development would be a sizeable addition to the existing size of the Village and would be more appropriately accommodated in a designated Key Service Centre Village.

d) Landscape Impact

A landscape and visual impact assessment was submitted in support of the application. It concluded that there would be some adverse landscape and visual effects at the outset, however they would be localised and limited in their extent, and overtime new infill hedgerow planting and tree planting would help to soften the impact. It is considered that the landscape impact over the first 10 year period would go from moderate adverse to minor beneficial, as the green infrastructure matures.

The assessment also looked at the visual impact on the surrounding properties. Due to the open views residents in Paynes Field currently have over the application site the visual impact of this outline application has been deemed to be adverse. It would be for the reserved matters layout and design of the proposed properties to deal with the relationship between the surrounding neighbours and the new proposed properties to ensure an acceptable relationship could be achieved in respect of privacy, light levels, overbearing impact. . In terms of the impacts from the adjacent properties on Bainton Road this would go from moderate adverse to negligible. At reserved matters stage the report concludes that high quality locally characteristic materials and building design would be required, with special attention to the detailing of the development gateway on to Uffington Road, to minimise the potential for adverse visual and landscape impacts.

Officers consider that the landscape susceptibility to change, value and sensitivity has been underestimated in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). Therefore overall the impacts would be higher than the report suggests. Effects on the character of the wider landscape are unlikely to result in unacceptable levels of harm, due to the site being relatively well-contained by topography. However effects on local landscape character are likely to be higher than predicted in the LVIA, and Officers consider the effects at year 10 on the local landscape would remain adverse. A well-designed locally appropriate and properly managed landscape scheme would help minimise the landscape impact, however it will take some time for new landscape planting to mature and provide landscape impact mitigation.

e) Impact on the Historic Environment

A Heritage Statement was submitted in support of the application. It identifies built heritage assets located within a 1km radius of the site. It then goes on to describe and assess the character and extent of the setting of the heritage assets. It then assesses the impacts of developing this site upon them, and if needed, explore ways that harm could be minimised.

The report identifies that the settings of 8 listed buildings and part of the Conservation Area are most likely to be affected by this development. However it concludes that in respect of the setting of the listed buildings that any harm to their significance would be negligible, and below the 'less than substantial' threshold of the NPPF. In respect of the impact on the Conservation Area the report notes that the development will be seen from parts of Conservation Area, on Stamford Road, and this will result in change to the area's wider setting. However it considers the impact will be limited by local topography, as the site falls away from the Conservation area from west to east. In addition the development will be read against the backdrop of the existing housing that adjoins it. The heights of dwellings will be 2 and 2.5 storeys, and so not overly prominent in the landscape.

Officers consider that the proposed development has the potential to impact on a number of heritage assets, including St John the Baptist Church (Grade 1) and the Barnack Conservation Area. As an outline application with all matters reserved bar access, a detailed assessment of the impact of the proposed development in terms of height and layout etc on surrounding heritage assets cannot be made, however an assessment has been carried out on the basis of the indicative framework plan.

In respect of assessing the impact of the development on the Grade 1 church, firstly the church is not visible from the application site. Secondly, in respect of views along Uffington Road Officers

conclude that the prominence of the church will not be significantly affected. The proposed development will result in change to the wider setting of the church and its significance. However this change would not harm the setting of the church and its significance.

The conservation area incorporates the historic core of the village. The village can be considered to have its origins in a 'nucleated' village form. Open space is a feature of the conservation area, especially in the north side of the village. Views out of the conservation area to the open countryside contribute to that character. Whilst over the years the nucleated form of the village has to a degree eroded, the character of the Conservation Area is still one of a relatively modest sized village built predominantly of stone. The northern boundary of the conservation area is Stamford Road and Bainton Road to the south of the proposed application site. The site is in agricultural use and abuts the new housing development of 41 dwellings in Paynes Field. The field makes a positive contribution to the landscape and rural setting of the village, though this has somewhat been reduced by the building of the Paynes Field housing development. The Paynes Field development of 41 dwellings has the appearance of a small estate form.

New development (up to 80 units) with similar 8-9m ridge heights would significantly increase a built form presence and visually change a small estate into a large estate form. The northern built edge of the village would change. The development site would be visible from Stamford Road, the northern edge of the conservation area. Views out to open countryside from the conservation area help contribute to the character of the nucleated village form, albeit eroded. The proposed development would add a further sense of suburbanisation to the surroundings of the conservation area. In nucleated villages the general form of development is typically highest density around the core, and lower density where they merge with the surrounding countryside. A development of 80 units adjacent to Paynes Field estate would create a dense development that would be out of scale at a village edge location where the historic form would be expected to see a lower scale and less dense development.

Section 72 of the 1990 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act requires a local planning authority to pay special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.

It is considered that the proposal would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the Barnack Conservation Area and not accord with Section 72(1), of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) and is not in accordance with Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and the National Planning Policy Framework (Heritage considerations).

The harm caused would be less than substantial and in accordance with paragraph 134 of the NPPF in such instances this level of harm needs to be weighed against the wider public benefits arising from the proposal, when reaching a decision. This allows the decision maker to approve development in instances where they consider the wider public benefits of a proposal would outweigh the harm caused to Conservation area. Officers consider the only wider public benefits that would arise from this scheme would be the provision of housing, affordable housing and the proposed open space areas. Therefore in this instance Officers do not consider that the wider public benefits, would outweigh the harm caused to the conservation area.

f) Archaeology

An archaeological desk based assessment has been submitted in support of the planning application. It identifies that the site has a high potential for early prehistoric evidence and a low/negligible potential for significant archaeological evidence for all other periods. On this basis it concludes that mitigation for archaeological interest can be secured by a planning condition.

However Peterborough City Council Archaeologist, has made the applicant aware of an aerial photographic assessment that was carried out in April 2015 to support a planning application for the creation of a reservoir on land north of Barnack, which revealed buried cut track ways,

enclosures, boundaries, pits, funerary sites and foci of settlement, the presence of which was confirmed by a geophysical survey. The assessment also identified crop marked buried enclosures, tracks and linear ditches and ring ditches, as well as upstanding medieval fields (ridge and furrow), to the south, east and south east of the site. These features, together with, casual observation of Iron Age and Roman finds in the general area, indicate the presence of a multi period archaeological landscape dating from prehistory through to the Roman period and later within the wider landscape.

In addition, immediately to the east of the site on the now built new housing site on Uffington Road, a programme of watching brief and excavation undertaken in 2010 revealed two adjacent Neolithic pits containing Grooved Ware pottery. Modern disturbance caused by residential development in the mid-20th century was mostly limited to the street frontage. Disturbance across the rest of the site was isolated and shallow. Below the modern disturbance was a mid-dark brown (medieval/post-medieval) cultivation soil.

Cartographic evidence shows that the application site has been predominantly used as arable and so any buried remains on site are likely to be relatively undisturbed.

Therefore on the basis of the available evidence, PCC's Archaeologist considers the site to have the potential to contain remains of all periods, and if remains are present, they are expected to survive in good condition. On this basis PCC Archaeologist recommendation is that a programme of archaeological work is carried out pre-determination, to inform the planning decision and provide mitigations for the consideration of the planning authority.

Mitigations are expected to reflect the character of the archaeology, the nature of the development, and the circumstances of the proposal. All influencing factors should be sufficiently characterised for the purpose of risk management.

The programme of archaeological work should include, geophysical survey, aerial photographic appraisal and evaluation by trial trenching.

The applicant archaeological consultant does not agree with this position and still believes that the further archaeological investigation works can be dealt with by condition. Therefore it is Officers recommendation that the application should be refused on the basis insufficient information has been provided to identify the archaeological potential of the site for the existence of prehistoric and/or Roman remains. And should such remains be present on site, offer suitable mitigation for their preservation. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies CS17 of the Core Strategy and Policy PP17 of the Planning Policies DPD, and the NPPF, in particular paragraphs 128 and 129.

g) Ecology

An ecological appraisal was submitted in support of the application.

The Barnack Hills and Holes National Nature Reserve (NNR), Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), and Special Area of Conservation (SAC) is located approximately 0.3km to the south of the site. The designation is an area of Jurassic limestone grassland on the site of an old quarry, which supports a number of nationally scarce plant species. Any development in the area has the potential to impact on this protected area through 1. Physical damage and disturbance from increased recreation, 2. Physical damage or disturbance from construction of water supply improvements and 3. Air pollution from increased road traffic.

Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy states 'Where new development has the potential to have an adverse effect on the integrity of an International or European site as a result of additional recreation pressure, the development may be required to provide open space of sufficient size and quality to accommodate that pressure. Suitable new green spaces will be located on or near to development sites.'

Natural England initially objected to the proposal on the grounds that they did not consider enough information had been provided to rule out the likelihood of significant effects on the Barnack Hills and Holes site. They advised that the applicant should provide a more detailed assessment of the effects of increased recreational pressure on Barnack Hills and Holes SAC, in order to enable the planning authority (as the competent authority) to fully consider these impacts in their Habitats Regulations Assessment. This was because the grassland communities at the SAC are currently under pressure from recreational disturbance through trampling, direct damage to the grassland and dog fouling, causing nutrient enrichment of the soil, resulting in an increase in competitive grass species to the detriment of the notified grass communities. Consequently any additional visitor pressure is likely to contribute towards adverse impacts on the site. They commented that the proposed on-site green infrastructure provision will help to lower the total number of additional visits to the SAC. The success of this will be dependent upon the quantity and quality of the accessible open space proposed on the application site. If this is well designed and managed it may be able to absorb a significant proportion of additional recreational pressure. Whether this is sufficient to ensure no adverse effect on the SAC will need to be demonstrated through the detailed study.

The applicant has responded to say that they are not willing to carry out such a survey, as they were not advised of this at the earlier pre-application stage. In the absence of such a survey Natural England would have said they be willing to accept a financial contribution towards suitable SAC management measures and to address the recreational pressures of the development, and offer suitable mitigation. This could include things such as dog bins, signage, community engagement and habitat protection measures. Therefore Natural England will remove its objection if a) an appropriate level of financial contribution to fund SAC management measures can be agreed and secured through an S106 legal agreement and b) details of on-site green infrastructure of 1.7 hectares can be agreed and secured by condition. Subject to securing these, they consider the Council as a Competent Authority could ascertain that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the SAC in accordance with the Conservation (of Habitats and Species) Regulation 2010 (as amended), and as such an appropriate assessment would not be required. The applicant's response to Natural England's requests are awaited and Members will be updated of their comments in the Update report.

The development proposes 1.7 hectares of green infrastructure, which includes 1.125ha of public open space and an ecological buffer of 0.41ha. Officers consider that the amount of green infrastructure (1.7ha), accessible natural green-space (1.125ha) and wildlife areas (0.41ha) as indicated on the framework plan are secured as an absolute minimum in order to provide confidence that impacts to the SSSI & SAC are adequately mitigated, as well as providing mitigation regarding protected species. An Ecological Management Plan or similar is also required to be secured by condition for the proposed Wildlife Area and associated green-spaces, detailing how this area will be managed for the benefit of wildlife. This should set out details of native tree, shrub and plant species, along with planting details for the establishment of the wild-flower areas and marginal aquatic planting around the proposed balancing pond.

The Barnack Grassland County Wildlife site is located approximately 0.4km to the south-west of the site. The designation comprises chalk grassland, which is home to populations of a number of nationally scarce plant species, including Man Orchid, and the Pasqueflower. The application is separated from this site by grassland and existing development therefore it is considered unlikely that this proposal will have any physical effect on the designation.

The next nearest County Wildlife Site is Walcot Hall Park, approximately 1.3km to the south of the site. This is similarly a chalk grassland, home to a population of national scarce Man Orchid. Due to the distance and separation of the sites it is unlikely the proposal will have any effect on this designation.

Whilst the hedgerows on site are likely to qualify as Priority Habitats, hedgerows are a common feature in this agricultural landscape, therefore on balance it is likely that the hedgerows on site are of no more than low ecological value at this local level. Therefore the loss of hedgerow to facilitate

the site access is considered to be of negligible to minor ecological significance.

Bats

The trees on site have been assessed and found to have negligible to no potential to support roosting bats. In respect of foraging/commuting for bats, the site is considered to be of low value at the local level, with greater foraging opportunities available in the surrounding landscape. Therefore whilst the local bat population is unlikely to be affected by the proposals, precautionary measures are recommended to safeguard the boundary features which have potential for commuting/foraging bats. These measures are in respect of any proposed lighting, to prevent excessive illumination of retained trees or hedgerows, which will help safeguard these as corridors for foraging/commuting bats. This could include directional lighting, reduced wattage lamps, and louvres to reduce night time illumination. Good practice on site management will be required during construction to ensure that there minimal disturbance or danger to any badgers on site.

Badgers

Evidence of recent badger activity was found within the site. An ecological area is proposed on site which provides a 30m buffer with the proposed development. This area will provide an inaccessible to the public ecology area and will help to safeguard any badger activity on site. A supervising ecologist will judge the likely disturbance that may be caused to badgers from the type of machinery to be used and the operation of machinery will be under the direction of the supervising ecologist at all times, where appropriate, and if necessary under a Natural England disturbance licence.

Officers consider the measures set out in sections 5.3.6 to 5.3.10 of the Ecological Appraisal should be adhered to, and secured by condition. This will include a requirement to carry out an updated survey in advance of commencement of any site clearance works.

The public open space and proposed ecology wildlife areas on site will provide potential foraging and laying up areas for Brown Hares for which there are records of in the vicinity of the site.

Amphibians

Given the nature of the habitats within the site, and their relative isolation in the local context in terms of potential Great Crested Newt breeding habitat, it is considered reasonably unlikely that this species is present within the site.

Reptiles

The site contains limited suitable reptile habitat and no evidence of reptiles was encountered during the survey work. As such the site is considered to be of low to negligible value to reptiles, and therefore the proposal is unlikely to adversely affect any reptile populations. However given the previous records of Common Lizard immediately adjacent to the site (however it is understood these were translocated to an off site receptor area when the site was developed for housing), precautionary measures will be undertaken in order to minimise the risk of harm to reptiles prior to construction.

Officers consider the precautionary measures set out in section 5.6.7 of the Ecological Appraisal should be adhered to, and secured by condition.

Birds

Any clearance of potential nesting habitat shall be done outside of the nesting season (i.e. March to August inclusive).

The ecology report identifies a number of measures that could enhance the biodiversity of the site,

these include the use of native tree and shrub planting, new wildflower grassland, proposed surface water attenuation features e.g. balancing pond, the provision of a range of bird (such as House sparrow, starling and swift) and bat boxes on site. These measures could be secured by conditions, or dealt with at the reserved matters stage.

Therefore it is considered that the proposed development would be in accordance with Policies CS21 of the Core Strategy and PP16 of the Planning Policies DPD.

h) Trees

An Arboricultural Impact Assessment was submitted in support of the proposal.

The site contains 7 individual trees, 8 groups of trees and 4 hedgerows. In the south east corner of the site are trees protected by Tree Preservation Orders 06/1992 and 08/2013.

Officers consider the survey information submitted clearly outlines the tree resource and the discussion of the merits or otherwise of the trees/hedgerows is an accurate portrayal of the site.

To allow the creation of a vehicle access from Uffington Road, it will involve the removal of 2 category B Ash trees, and the entirety of boundary hedge H1. T2 Ash in particular had symptoms of the decay fungus *Inonotus hispidus* and T1 Ash could not be described as a 'specimen' tree. The boundary hedgerow H1 consists mainly of dead Elm and is of low quality. Obviously the preferred option for the access would be to remove H1 and retain the Ash, however, there would be no objection to the Ash trees removal if successfully justified. Officers consider the need to achieve the visibility splays for the new access on highway safety grounds is sufficient justification for the loss of the 2 trees, and hedgerow.

An additional pedestrian link to Uffington Road is proposed and this will involve the partial removal of category B group G6. Care must be taken when installing the pedestrian footpath to Uffington Road, where there may be encroachment within adjacent root protection of trees subject to Tree Preservation Orders. The pedestrian linkage to Uffington Road would pass through W1 of TPO 08/2013. Several trees would require removal which have not been identified in detail. However, a site visit has concluded that the majority of the trees that would require removal are young, self set sycamore that are at pole stage. Their loss would not be a significant loss of amenity. The specification in this area of a 'above surface' construction of the footpath is justified and acceptable in the circumstances.

A further permissive footpath is proposed to link the site to Bainton Road, this will involve the removal of around 10m of hedgerow H3 and using an existing gap within Hedgerow H4. The permissive footpath to Bainton Road appears to be low impact and is unlikely to lead to tree loss or be detrimental to the amenity of the area.

Elsewhere on the site tree/hedgerow loss is likely to be limited.

Clearance works should avoid the bird nesting season, and retained trees and hedgerows shall have protective barriers erected to prevent damage during construction. An arboricultural method statement, and detailed tree protection drawings should be secured by way of a planning condition. In addition full and detailed landscape details would be required along with implementation and maintenance plans.

It is noted that to the south of the site that offsite trees are likely to shade any houses close to the boundary. Therefore at reserved matters stage the shading arcs illustrated on the arboricultural plans will need to be considered and any proposed dwellings in this area designed and sited to minimise the impact, and ensure any acceptable resulting relationship with these retained trees.

Officers therefore raise no objection subject to the imposition of conditions, as it is considered the tree loss is likely to be limited and it appears that there are feasible ways of protecting retained trees during construction. New native planting can also be secured by condition.

The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policies PP16 of the Planning Policies DPD and Policy CS21 of the Core Strategy.

i) Highway Implications

Access is being committed and considered under this current outline planning application. A Transport Assessment and Travel Plan have been submitted in support of the application.

Vehicular Access

Access to the site is proposed to be taken from Uffington Road.

Two possible access arrangements were put forward under this application.

1. The positioning of the access between the 2 existing trees on the site frontage, which would result in the loss of these trees. However this access, due to the removal of the trees, would be able to achieve the required visibility splays (2.4m x 91m to the south and 2.4m x 79m to the north) to meet the actual measured speed of vehicles using the road, which is in excess of the 30mph speed limit; or

2. The positioning of the access to the south of the 2 trees on the site frontage and to the north of the substation. However in this position, whilst the trees could be retained, only 2.4m x 40m visibility splays could be achieved. Therefore traffic calming measures would also be required to be introduced, to reduce the actual speed of vehicles using the road closer to the 30mph speed limit and to reflect the reduced visibility splays that could be achieved.

Officers view in highway safety terms is that the proposed access option 1, where the visibility splays proposed are designed to meet the actual measured traffic speeds outside the site would be the preferable access option, albeit this would result in the loss of the two trees.

The Local Highway Authority objected to the initial proposal on the grounds that neither of the above accesses had addressed the widening of the road south of the application site, where there was a pinch point on Uffington Road. Therefore due to the insufficient geometry of Uffington Road both proposed accesses would lead to highway safety dangers.

In addition, for the proposed second access option detailed above, where new traffic calming was proposed to help reduce existing speeding, no conceptual design was submitted, or Stage 1 Safety Audit therefore no assessment of the acceptability of these traffic calming measures could be made. A localised area of traffic calming in isolation would not be acceptable, and the offer to part fund a larger traffic calming scheme to the south of the site, would not provide the necessary certainty that such a scheme could ever be delivered in future.

A technical Note was subsequently submitted to address the objection raised.

It has been established that the boundary hedge on Uffington Road is of poor quality therefore its loss would not be resisted. One of the two Ash trees on the site frontage has symptoms of a decay fungus therefore its loss could also not be resisted. The other Ash tree on the site frontage is not a 'specimen' tree therefore whilst its retention would be welcome, if there was good reason for its removal it would be difficult to resist. It is considered the provision of a safe access into the site with the required visibility splays, to prevent highway safety dangers to road users would be sufficient reason to justify removal of this tree. Therefore the first proposed vehicle access option, with the loss of the hedge and two trees, is considered to be the best access option in highway safety terms.

In terms of the width of Uffington Road and the applicant is willing to accept a condition to widen the carriageway of Uffington Road to at least 5m in width from the junction of 'The Acres' northwards to the southern boundary of the site. In addition this condition would cover the widening of the carriageway of Uffington Road to 5.5m adjacent to the proposed access point, and the provision of a 3m wide footpath along the site frontage to tie into the existing 2m footway. The 2.4m x 91m to the south and the 2.4m x 79m to north would also be secured by condition.

A detailed travel plan, to encourage residents to use sustainable travel modes, incorporate SMART targets, and include householder travel packs with either cycle or bus pass vouchers as an incentive is recommended to be secured by condition.

Pedestrian Access

It is proposed to have 3 pedestrian connections from the site to the existing surrounding pedestrian infrastructure. 1. to the south west corner of the site linking the site to Bainton Road, this will be via a newly constructed permissive footpath on land within the control of the applicant. 2. To the south east corner of the site, linking to Uffington Road, via a proposed footpath through a woodland area to the north of Linden Close. 3. At the new vehicle access onto Uffington Road a new 3m wide footpath is proposed to connect into the existing one south of the application site, this would be secured by condition.

A travel plan is proposed to try and encourage residents to walk, cycle, or take the bus where possible and as a more sustainable travel mode than the private car.

Therefore subject to the imposition of conditions the proposed development is considered to be acceptable in highway safety terms and in accordance with Policy PP12 of the Planning Policy DPD.

j) Drainage/Flood Risk

A Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy was submitted in support of the application. The application site is located within Flood Zone 1, where it is considered that there is a low probability of flooding, e.g. having a less than 1 in 1,00 annual probability of river or sea flooding. All land uses are considered to be appropriate within this zone.

As part of the submitted flood risk assessment, there is a requirement for incorporation of sustainable urban drainage systems to deal with the surface water drainage and run off from the development site.

The Drainage Officer objected to the application on the grounds that the whole site was proposed to drain via infiltration, however in part of the document submitted it said that the infiltration method of permeable paving might be limited due to groundwater protection zones. There was obviously discrepancy about the use of whole site infiltration drainage, if on some areas of the site there is doubt about whether permeable paving could be used. Concerns were also raised in the proposed sizing of the infiltration basin, and whether the correct methodology to do this was used.

Amended drainage information and a strategy plan was received, confirming the use of permeable paving where possible on site and swales where permeable paving is not possible, and swales to divert overland excess flows to the proposed infiltration basin. On this basis our Drainage Officer's objection has been overcome and subject to the imposition of a drainage condition.

The proposed development is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policy CS22 of the Core Strategy.

k) Minerals & Waste

The 4.28ha application site sits upon two Mineral Safeguarding Areas, designated for deposits of sand and gravel, and limestone, which are considered to be of current or future economic importance.

Policy CS26 Minerals Safeguarding Areas of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy states;

Development will only be permitted where it has been demonstrated to the Mineral Planning Authority that;

1. The mineral concerned is no longer of any economic value or potential value, or
2. The mineral can be extracted prior to the development taking place, or
3. The development will not inhibit extraction if required in the future, or
4. There is overriding need for the development and prior extraction cannot be reasonably undertaken, or
5. The development is not incompatible

Therefore the initial information submitted with the application failed to address Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Policy CS26. Policy CS26 is in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (144) which states that “local authorities should not normally permit other development proposals in mineral safeguarding area where they might constrain potential future use for these purposes.” Therefore objection was raised.

A Minerals Safeguarding report was subsequently submitted. This report identified that the sand and gravel resource on site only covered an area of approximately 0.6 ha, about 13% of the site. It detailed that it was part of a larger linear deposit, but it was isolated from rest by the presence of Uffington Road. This isolation renders the linear deposit unviable since it is narrow in extent and the mineral will be thin as it is close to the edge of the overall deposit. Furthermore, the resource is within a buffer zone which would be required to protect the residential development to the east. As a consequence the sand and gravel in the site would never be worked and as a result it has no economic value or potential value. The bedrock beneath the site is limestone. However this area is also within 200 metres of existing residential property so in order to protect the amenity of those properties, it would not be granted planning permission for extraction due to its proximity to the existing properties. The report therefore concludes that the minerals in the sand and gravel and the limestone would never be worked and so they have no economic value or potential value. Therefore the proposal is in accordance with Policy CS26 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy.

Officers have assessed the Mineral Safeguarding Report (January 2016) submitted and are in agreement with the findings that the mineral resources (including both sand and gravel and limestone) are not a viable economic resource. Therefore this objection has now been overcome and Officers consider the proposal is in accordance with policy CS26 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy.

l) Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

Peterborough City Council now have an adopted CIL Charging Schedule. Peterborough City Council are obliged to collect the CIL from liable parties (usually either developers or landowners). All applications identified as CIL liable will incur a CIL charge. As this is an outline application we will not be able to issue a liability notice confirming the amount of CIL that is due until we receive reserved matters details. A CIL Questions form has been submitted by the applicant.

m) Public Consultation

The additional information submitted in respect of Highway, Drainage, Minerals and Waste, Archaeology and in response to Natural England’s comments is currently out to public consultation, and any further comments received in respect of this additional information will be reported to Members in the Update Report.

In addition the latest Natural England (NE) latest comments have been sent to the applicant for their response. Members should be aware that should the applicant fail to agree the provision of a financial contribution and securing the 1.7 hectares on site green infrastructure requested by Natural England, then NE previous objection would remain, and this is likely to lead to a further reason for refusal. Members will be advised of the applicant's response in the Update report.

6 Conclusions

The proposal is unacceptable having been assessed in light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and for the specific reasons given below.

7 Recommendation

The Head of Development and Construction recommends that Outline Planning Permission is **REFUSED**

R1 The application site is located in the countryside, outside of the village envelope of the Limited Growth village of Barnack. The proposal for up to 80 dwellings, with 30% affordable housing provision is therefore contrary to Policy CS1, which restricts development in the countryside to that which is essential to the effective operation of local agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and access to natural greenspace, transport or utility services. The proposal does not meet the exception test of Policy CS8, as it is not proposing a higher provision of on-site affordable housing to meet a specific and demonstrable local need, in excess of the standard policy requirement.

R2 There is no need for this development because the City Council on 15th Jan 2016, published its 5 year housing land supply document, which demonstrates that the Council has a 5 year housing land supply. Therefore in accordance with the NPPF, paragraph 49, the policies of the adopted development plan are considered up to date and do not need to be set aside as per the NPPF in instances where a 5 year deliverable supply of housing land cannot be demonstrated. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the NPPF and Development Plan, as it constitutes housing in the open countryside where there is no demonstrable need.

R3 The proposal to erect up to 80 dwellings on this agricultural field adjacent to but outside of the village envelope of Barnack is considered to be of too large and of an inappropriate size and scale to be acceptably accommodated on the rural edge of the Village. It is considered that the landscape and visual impact of the proposed development, and its cumulative visual impact with the adjacent 41 dwelling Paynes Field development would have a harmful urbanising effect, inappropriate to character and setting of rural edge of the village. This is contrary to Policy CS20 of the Core Strategy, and Policy B& P 1 of the Peterborough Design and Development in Selected Villages (2011) Supplementary Planning Document.

R4 The size and scale of the development proposed of up to 80 dwellings is considered too large for this Limited Growth Village and the facilities it contains, therefore the proposed development is not considered to be sustainable. The size and scale of development proposed would not accord with the locational hierarchy for new residential as per Policy CS2, which would direct this size and scale of growth to a Key Service Village or the City of Peterborough, because this would be more sustainable.

R5 The current application site makes a positive contribution to the landscape and rural setting of the village. Views out to open countryside from the conservation area help contribute to the character of the nucleated village form. A development of up to 80 units, positioned directly adjacent to the 41 dwelling Paynes Field estate, would create a dense form of development that would be out of scale at the village edge location where the historic form would expect to see a lower scale and less dense development. This would result in harm to the character and

appearance of the conservation area. Therefore it is considered that the proposal would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the of the Barnack Conservation Area and not accord with Section 72(1), of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) and is not in accordance with Policy CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and the National Planning Policy Framework (Heritage considerations). As the harm caused would be less than substantial and in accordance with paragraph 134 of the NPPF this would need to be weighed against the wider public benefits arising from the proposal. It is not considered in this instance that any wider public benefits this housing development could bring would be sufficient to outweigh the harm caused to the Conservation Area.

R6 The application site is located within an area of high archaeological value where any surviving assets are expected to survive in good condition and could be damaged and destroyed by the proposed development. The application has not been supported with sufficient information to enable an assessment of the need for suitable mitigation, which may include the preservation if archaeological assets in situ, to be made prior to the issue of any planning permission for the development of the site. The application as submitted fails to comply with Policies CS17 of the Core Strategy, Policy PP17 of the Planning Policy DPD and paragraphs 128 and 129 of the NPPF, which seek to ensure protection for archaeological sites from unnecessary damage by development.

Copy to Cllr Over