

**Application Ref:** 14/02126/OUT

**Proposal:** Erection of up to nine dwellings

**Site:** Rear Of 39 Station Road, Thorney, Peterborough,  
**Applicant:** Mr N Sherwood

**Agent:** Mr J Dickie, John Dickie Associates

**Referred by:** **Director of Growth and Regeneration**  
**Reason:** Given the decision taken by Members on an adjacent site

**Site visit:** 11.02.2015

**Case officer:** Miss Louise Lovegrove  
**Telephone No.** 01733 454439  
**E-Mail:** louise.lovegrove@peterborough.gov.uk

**Recommendation:** **REFUSE**

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

### **Site and Surroundings**

The application site comprises a parcel of land located on the eastern side of Station Road and within the identified settlement envelope of Thorney. To the front of the site are two no. buildings which comprise residential flats (6no. 1-bed flats in Sherwood House, No.39 and 3no. 1-bed flats at No.41) and there is an existing vehicular access to the site running between these two buildings. Within the application site are a series of single storey outbuildings which appear to be in use and these are set within an area which appears to have been maintained as amenity space. There is a line of mature Leyland Cypress trees which run north-south through the middle of the site and beyond this, an area of grassed paddock land.

The eastern boundary of the site comprises a belt of mature Norway Spruce whilst the southern boundary is formed by a line of mature trees, shrubs and fencing with an agricultural paddock and garden land beyond. To the north of the site there is a residential dwelling known as Shirefield House and an industrial unit known as Shirefield Works.

The application site is not located within the Thorney Conservation Area however it is in close proximity to its northern boundary and the Grade II Listed Tankyard building.

### **Proposal**

The application seeks outline planning permission with all matters reserved (access, layout, appearance, landscaping and scale) for the construction of up to nine residential dwellings with associated access, parking and amenity space.

## **2 Planning History**

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Date</b>
07/01346/FUL	Conversion of house into seven 1-bed flats including changes to doors and windows and provision of parking and amenity space	Permitted	09/04/2008
09/00180/FUL	Conversion of existing dwelling into 5 one-bed and 1 three-bed self-contained flats - retrospective	Permitted	11/05/2009

## **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 7 - Good Design**

Development should add to the overall quality of the area; establish a strong sense of place; optimise the site potential; create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses; support local facilities and transport networks; respond to local character and history while not discouraging appropriate innovation; create safe and accessible environments which are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping. Planning permission should be refused for development of poor design.

#### **Section 10 - Development and Flood Risk**

New development should be planned to avoid increased vulnerability to the impacts of climate change. Inappropriate development in areas of flood risk should be avoided by directing it away from areas at higher risk. Where development is necessary it shall be made safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Applications should be supported as appropriate by a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment, a Sequential Test and, if required, the Exception Test.

#### **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.

## **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.

### **CS10 - Environment Capital**

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

### **CS12 - Infrastructure**

Permission will only be granted where there is, or will be via mitigation measures, sufficient infrastructure capacity to support the impacts of the development.

### **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.

### **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.

## **Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012)**

### **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.

### **PP04 - Amenity Provision in New Residential Development**

Proposals for new residential development should be designed and located to ensure that they provide for the needs of the future residents.

### **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.

### **PP13 - Parking Standards**

Permission will only be granted if appropriate parking provision for all modes of transport is made in accordance with standards.

### **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.

## **Peterborough Design and Development in Selected Villages SPD (2011)**

### **Thor 12 - Properties Outside the Conservation Area**

New buildings should reflect the character of the surrounding development however on sites which are not immediately constrained by neighbouring traditional buildings, there may be scope for innovation. The design of any development abutting the surrounding landscape should reflect the historical and geographical perspective.

### **Thor 13 – Building Materials for New Development Outside the Conservation Area that Affects the Character and Appearance of the Historic Village in its Landscape Setting**

Planning permission should only be granted if the proposed building materials and the manner that they are used are sympathetic to the local building tradition.

## **Peterborough Flood and Water Management SPD (2012)**

### **Chapter 4 – Guidance on Site Selection for Sites within Flood Zones**

This chapter sets out guidance on how to apply the Sequential and Exception Tests.

## **4 Consultations/Representations**

### **Thorney Parish Council (10.02.15)**

Support - As with the adjacent site immediately to the north, consider this infill site as a preferred development site in the village. As a partially previously developed site it complies with our view that preference should be given to the development of a Brownfield site. As a site located within the village envelope it does not extend development into the surrounding countryside and thereby encroach upon the rural setting of the village. This is enhanced by the retention of the area of trees at the eastern end of the site which is not included as part of the development site. The site is ideal as it is tucked away behind the existing dwelling on the Station Road frontage and, as a consequence, will have little or no visual impact on the village. The site is readily accessible from the by-pass and is unlikely to generate much traffic through the village. Due to the site's close proximity to the sewage works it will not generate the drainage/sewage infrastructure problems that are of concern with other sites in the village. We welcome the proposal to construct bungalows as this type of dwelling seems popular and viable in the village. The very quick sale of the 5 bungalows recently constructed to the rear of 81 Wisbech Road with access from Topham Crescent, Thorney are evidence of this. We do not feel these dwellings will have a detrimental impact on the character, appearance or amenity of the location and we are pleased that the site is readily accessible with only minor modifications required to the existing point of entry from Station Road. The scale and density of this proposal provides the dwellings with generous gardens and provision for parking. As a Key Service Centre we are of the opinion that we need some limited growth to help sustain our existing facilities. We therefore welcome the development of infill sites such as this with its good proximity to those facilities including the public transport route through the village. We are aware that the site is within a flood risk zone but believe that the benefits of this development to the community outweigh this risk. There are clearly simple ways of resisting the risk through the method and form of construction. We understand that the North Level Drainage

Board who are based in Thorney have no objections to this application. We are also aware that the same flood risks applied to the Harlock site immediately to the north of the application site and in part to the Rose and Crown public house site to the south of this site and that both these sites were granted approval by the City Council. We see no reason why there should not be a consistency of approach in the Council's review of this application and we would recommend that it is also granted approval.

**PCC Tree Officer (08.01.15)**

No objections – Whilst the application has been accompanied by an Arboricultural Report, this does not precisely detail the trees to be retained/removed. This is not unacceptable and adequate measures can readily be secured by a condition.

**Archaeological Officer (17.12.14)**

No objections - Whilst the submitted archaeological appraisal indicates that the site has low potential, evidence of seasonal occupation should not be discounted and the site may yield important information on depositional sequences. As such, request a condition securing evaluation by trial trenching.

**Building Control Manager**

No comments received.

**PCC Pollution Team (12.01.15)**

No objections – Given that the site is located close to the disused railway line and Thorney Gas Works, a condition relating to unsuspected contamination is recommended. In addition, the site is located 280 metres from the A47 Trunk Road, close by to industrial uses and nearby noise assessments have indicated that the site is likely to be subject to high noise levels. Therefore, a noise assessment is required to identify noise sources and mitigation measures required to ensure future occupants are not subject to noise disturbance.

**PCC Transport & Engineering Services (29.12.14)**

No objections – It is noted that the proposed access is intended to be adopted public highway and that the submitted site layout is indicative only. Request a number of conditions relating to access width (no less than 5.5 metres), provision of parking and turning, junction visibility splays and a construction management plan.

**PCC Drainage Team (29.12.14)**

No objections – Whilst the Applicant proposes the use of soakaways to deal with surface water drainage, this may not be appropriate and a more thorough assessment of the ground conditions and water table depth are required.

**PCC S106 Planning Obligations Officer (11.12.14)**

Until the precise number and mix of dwelling sizes is known, the exact POIS contribution cannot be calculated.

**Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service (22.01.15)**

Adequate provision for fire hydrants should be made and the full cost should be met by the Developer.

**Environment Agency (23.12.14)**

No objections – It is the responsibility of the Local Planning Authority to undertake the Sequential and Exception Tests in respect of flood risk. Should these tests be met, request a condition requiring implementation of the resilience measures set out in the submitted Flood Risk Assessment.

**Waste Management**

No comments received.

### **Police Architectural Liaison Officer (23.12.14)**

No objections – Request further consultation once layout is submitted.

### **North Level District Internal Drainage Board (30.12.14)**

No objections in principle – Require more detail with regards to the surface water drainage systems and if run-off exceeds a certain level, levies will be applied.

### **Local Residents/Interested Parties**

Initial consultations: 13

Total number of responses: 2

Total number of objections: 0

Total number in support: 1 (Parish Council)

One letter of **support** has been received on the following grounds:

- A development of bungalows is an excellent project, the site is to the north of the village with the traffic close to the bypass unlike the proposed development on Woburn Drive which will mean all traffic coming down Woburn Drive and through the village.

One further comment was received however this simply requested additional information regarding the proposal.

## **5 Assessment of the planning issues**

The main considerations are:

- Principle of development, including flood risk
- Density and layout
- Access and highway implications
- Impact upon the setting of heritage assets and archaeology
- Neighbour amenity
- Amenity provision for future occupants
- Trees and landscape implications
- Drainage
- Developer contributions

### **a) Principle of development, including flood risk**

As detailed in Section 1 above, the application site is located within the settlement boundary of Thorney, a village which itself is identified as a Key Service Centre. The site has not formally been allocated for residential development through the Peterborough Site Allocations DPD (2012) and is therefore considered as a 'windfall site'.

Policy CS1 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) states that planned growth in the rural areas will be focused within Key Service Centres and, to a lesser extent, Limited Growth Villages. In these settlements, new residential sites of more than 10 dwellings will be allocated whereas developments for fewer dwellings will be treated as windfall sites. As this current proposal falls below the 10 dwelling threshold, it does not represent development for which a site would be allocated however it does broadly accord with the focusing of development to Key Service Centres.

In addition to the above, the site falls within Flood Zone 3 which is at the highest risk from flooding. Residential development of this nature falls within the category of 'more vulnerable' development as defined by the National Online Planning Guidance and accordingly, must be subject to assessment through both the Sequential and Exception Tests, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

As set out above, it is noted that the North Level District Internal Drainage Board and the Environment Agency have not raised any objections to the proposal. However, their purpose

is not to comment upon the proposal in terms of applying the Sequential and Exception Tests and this role falls to the Local Planning Authority.

### Sequential Test

Turning first to the Sequential Test, paragraph 101 of the NPPF requires that development be directed to those areas which are least likely to flood (i.e. Flood Zone 1) and these are the most sequentially preferable sites. Further, the City Council has its own Flood and Water Management SPD (2012) which sets out the process for undertaking such a test.

The application has been accompanied by a Sequential Test document which details the availability of sites which are either allocated or marketed within an agreed area of geographical search (Thorney, Eye and Eye Green) and at an agreed size (no smaller than the application site). However, the submitted assessment has not taken into account those sites which were previously put forward for allocation and rejected as part of the Site Allocations DPD Evidence Base Report. Many of these sites were rejected owing to 'need' issues i.e. that other sites within the settlements were available and of a sufficient size to meet the required level of growth (25,500 houses by 2026). Therefore, these rejected sites must be considered as part of the Sequential Test. Accordingly, the application has failed to adequately undertake a robust Sequential Test and fails on this basis.

Notwithstanding the above, the Applicant's measure of sites being 'reasonably available' is also rejected. The Sequential Test undertaken has considered sites as being unavailable by virtue of the land not being able to be sold off to the Developer (in the case of larger sites, those being able to be sub-divided into smaller plots). This is not accepted as the test is whether the development itself can be delivered (i.e. the houses physically built) which could be on any land and by any Developer. Land ownership and what a land owner wants to do is not a material consideration and therefore is a reason to discount this assessment. Within the area of search accepted by Officers, there are allocated sites which are both presently being developed and are available for development subject to permission. These unconsented sites are still considered to be reasonably available as the ability for the land to be developed is a material consideration as part of the site allocation process in 2011/12.

### Exception Test

Turning next to the Exception Test, paragraph 102 of the NPPF sets out two parts which must be met: a) that the development would offer wider sustainability benefits to the community which outweigh the flood risk; and b) that the development would be safe for its lifetime and not result in increased flood risk elsewhere. In terms of the wider sustainability benefits, the Applicant has undertaken an assessment of the proposal based upon the Sustainable Community Strategy 2008-21. This basis is accepted however it is considered that this is not the only measure of determining wider sustainability benefits.

In the case of this application, the proposal seeks to provide open market housing on a windfall site. However, the City Council has set out adequate allocations to meet the requirement for housing of 25,500 additional dwellings within the plan period to march 2026. Moreover, the Peterborough Five Year Housing Land Supply report from July 2014 demonstrates that the City Council is achieving an adequate 5-year housing land supply. On this basis, it is not considered that there is an overriding need for the housing proposed by the development. It is the view of Officer's that this need is fundamental to assessing whether the proposal delivers wider sustainability benefits that outweigh the flood risk and in this instance, the test is not met.

In terms of safety and not increasing flood risk elsewhere, the Environment Agency has confirmed that they raise no objections to the proposal on this basis. The submitted Flood Risk Assessment details a number of measures to be incorporated into the final design of the dwellings (to be secured at Reserved Matters stage) including minimum floor levels and design features. These could readily be secured by way of a condition to ensure that the development would be safe for its lifetime.

On this basis it is considered that the application has failed to demonstrate that there are no more reasonably available sites located within areas of lower flood risk which could accommodate the development and that there is no wider sustainability benefit to the community which would outweigh the flooding risks. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to paragraphs 100, 101 and 102 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), Policy CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Chapter 4 of the Peterborough Flood and Water Management SPD (2012).

**b) Density and layout**

It should be noted that the submitted site layout is indicative only, as at this stage matters of layout, appearance, scale and landscaping are reserved. Notwithstanding this, any submitted layout must adequately demonstrate that the level of development proposal can be acceptably accommodated within the site.

With regards to the location of the development, it would partially be located on land not previously developed. However, it would be within the confines of the settlement boundary and its outer boundary would tie in with the adjacent industrial site to the north. It is considered that physical development in this location would not appear at odds with the surrounding locality and would not result in any unacceptable expansion of the settlement or impact to the setting of the open countryside to the east.

Based upon the indicative layout, it is considered that the size of the dwellings proposed cannot comfortably be fitted within the site in their present number. The dwellings would leave no outdoor private amenity space for the existing flats within the site and as such, a larger area would need to be given over to this thereby reducing the available developable space. Notwithstanding this, smaller dwellings or fewer dwellings could be approved on the site and it is noted that the application seeks permission for up to 9 dwellings. As such, it is considered that the proposal would, subject to careful design and amendment from the layout shown, provide an acceptable density of development.

On this basis, the proposal is in accordance with Policies CS16 and CS20 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and Policy Thor 12 of the Peterborough Design and Development in Selected Villages SPD (2011).

**c) Access and highway implications**

As detailed in Section 1 above, the application originally sought outline approval for residential development with all matters reserved. Irrespective of this, the Applicant has indicated that the access to the site and internal roadway would be put forward for adoption. The Local Highway Authority has reviewed the submitted information and raised no objections to the proposal. In terms of the vehicular access, this would need to be a minimum of 5.5 metres wide (as it serves multiple dwellings and needs to allow vehicles to pass one another) and there is adequate space within the site to accommodate this requirement. Furthermore, the submitted layout is sufficient to demonstrate that adequate parking and turning can be provided within the site to ensure that vehicles can enter and exit on to Station Road in a forward gear.

More precise details of the access and internal parking/turning arrangement can be secured by condition and resolved at Reserved Matters stage.

On this basis, it is considered that the proposal would not result in any unacceptable impact to the safety of the public highway network and is therefore in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

**d) Impact upon the setting of heritage assets and archaeology**

The application site itself is not located within the identified Thorney Conservation Area,



however it is in close proximity to its southern boundary and only separated by a parcel of open, undeveloped land. Furthermore, this southern boundary includes the curtilage of the Grade II Listed Tankyard. Accordingly, any development within the application site must be considered in terms of impact upon the setting of these heritage assets.

The Local Planning Authority has a statutory duty to preserve or enhance the setting of these assets. Whilst at present there is no development on part of the site, it does fall within the identified settlement boundary and would follow the outermost boundary of existing development to the north. Whilst matters of layout, appearance and scale of the proposed dwellings are to be reserved, the Applicant proposes that these dwellings do not exceed 1 and a half storeys in height. This would therefore limit the impact of the development, particularly when looking towards the Conservation Area and Listed Building from the North. By virtue of the existing development surrounding the site, and the proposed limited scale of the proposal (which could be secured by condition), it is considered that the proposal would at least preserve the setting of the nearby heritage assets and would not result in unacceptable harm.

Turning to archaeology, the Applicant has indicated that they believe the site to be of low archaeological potential by virtue of the presence of existing buildings. This is noted however the City Council's Archaeologist has advised that the site could contain evidence for seasonal occupation and may yield important information on depositional sequences. Accordingly, a condition requiring evaluation has been requested and it is considered that this would be both appropriate and necessary to ensure that no important undiscovered heritage assets are harmed by the proposal.

On the basis of the above, the proposal is in accordance with Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, paragraphs 131 and 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), Policy CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

**e) Neighbour amenity**

Whilst the submitted layout is indicative only, it does show the proposed developable area. There are two existing buildings to the front of the site which comprise residential flats. The proposal would leave these flats with very little or no outdoor amenity area. Whilst this is not unusual for residential flats, given the location of the site within a village and not close by to areas of public open space, it is considered necessary for the flats to be left with some outdoor space for occupants. This could however be achieved through a revised layout which would be submitted at Reserved Matters stage. Similarly, any future layout would be assessed to ensure it retained adequate separation distances to maintain privacy.

On the basis of the above, it is considered that the proposal (subject to appropriate layout at Reserved Matters stage) would not result in any unacceptable impact to the amenities of neighbouring occupants. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

**f) Amenity provision for future occupants**

Noise

The application site is located within close proximity to the A47 Trunk Road and the City Council's Pollution Control Officer has advised that noise assessments undertaken in respect of nearby sites have identified that noise levels are in exceedance of levels which would be deemed acceptable for a good quality of amenity for future occupants. That does not however preclude development, as a series of measures could be introduced which would attenuate this noise disturbance. Accordingly, a condition is deemed necessary which would require a detailed noise assessment along with the submission of mitigation measures.

Contamination

Whilst the site itself is not suspected as being a contamination risk, it is located in close proximity to a disused railway and the former Thorney Gas Works. To ensure that no risk to human health is posed, the Pollution Control Officer has advised that a condition be imposed relating to unsuspected contamination. This would ensure that if any unsuspected contaminants were found to be present within the site, a suitable scheme of remediation would need to be submitted and approved.

On the basis of the above, it is considered that the proposal would afford an acceptable level of amenity for future occupants and as such, the proposal is in accordance with Policies PP4 and PP20 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

**g) Trees and landscape implications**

The application has been accompanied by an Arboricultural Assessment which has broadly been accepted by the City Council's Tree Officer. However, this assessment does not make clear which trees are to be retained and which are to be lost. As such, a condition has been recommended which requires a more detailed assessment be undertaken. Notwithstanding this, there is a belt of trees located to the eastern-most boundary of the site, outside the application boundary. These trees would be retained which would ensure that key landscape features would not be lost. Furthermore, appropriate landscaping to the public areas of the development could be secured by condition to ensure that the development is softened and respects its rural setting at the edge of the village boundary. On the basis of this, the proposal is in accordance with Policy PP20 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2011) and Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

**h) Drainage**

The supporting information accompanying the application details that surface water drainage is to be managed through the use of soakaways. Given that the site is located within Flood Zone 3, the City Council's Drainage Engineer has advised that at this stage, it is unclear as to whether soakaways are an appropriate method of drainage albeit no objections were raised. Furthermore, the North Level District Internal Drainage Board has raised no objections on the grounds of drainage from the site.

Further information has been requested in relation to a detailed ground survey report and measure of the ground water level to demonstrate the suitability of this method of drainage. This is noted and it is proposed that surface water drainage be dealt with by way of a condition to ensure that it is adequately dealt with and does not pose a risk of flooding elsewhere. Subject to such a condition, the proposal is in accordance with Policy CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011).

**i) Developer contributions**

The Government has recently published revised guidance in respect of pooled financial contributions towards the infrastructure demands generated by developments of 10 residential units or fewer, and which have a combined floorspace of less than 1000 sqm. This guidance supersedes the Peterborough Planning Obligations Implementation SPD (2010) for qualifying developments. Whilst the proposal meets the first part of the threshold, it is unclear at this stage. However, as the layout, scale and appearance of the dwellings are to be reserved, a condition can readily be imposed which limits the overall floorspace. Subject to such a condition, no financial contribution is being sought for the proposed development, in accordance with the National Online Planning Guidance.

## **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 Director of Growth and Regeneration recommends that Outline Planning Permission is **REFUSED** for the following reason:

- R 1 The application site is located within Flood Zone 3 and is therefore at the highest risk of flooding. The proposed residential development of up to 9 dwellings, classed as 'more vulnerable' development is inappropriate within this location. The application has failed to demonstrate that there are no more sequentially preferable sites available for the proposed development and in addition, the proposal would not provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that would outweigh the risk of flooding. Accordingly, the proposal fails to meet both the Sequential and Exception Tests with regards to flood risk and is therefore contrary to paragraphs 100, 101 and 102 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), Policy CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Chapter 4 of the Peterborough Flood and Water Management SPD (2012).

This page is intentionally left blank