

Application Ref: 17/01253/OUT

Proposal: Construction of 14 new homes include 4 self-build plots with access secured and all other matters reserved (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale)

Site: Land To The East Of 29, Peakirk Road, Glington, Peterborough
Applicant: Mr Charles Jacobs

Agent: Mrs Freddy Richley, Hereward Homes Ltd

Referred by: Director of Growth and Regeneration
Reason: Departure from adopted Local Plan

Site visit: 25.09.2017

Case officer: Mrs Louise Simmonds
Telephone No. 01733 454439
E-Mail: louise.simmonds@peterborough.gov.uk

Recommendation: **REFUSE**

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

Site and Surroundings

The application site covers an area of approximately 1.01 hectares and is located within the open countryside, outside the identified settlement boundary of the Limited Growth Village of Glington.

The site currently forms part of a wider agricultural field which is bound to the south by a mature, and in part ancient, hedgerow/shelter belt. This feature runs for approximately 400 metres to the east of the village, along the northern boundary of Peakirk Road/St Pegas Road, before turning northward along the field boundary. Beyond this feature is a drainage ditch running alongside the public highway of Peakirk Road with residential dwellings beyond.

To the west of the site is No.29 Peakirk Road, a single storey residential dwelling. To the rear of this neighbouring dwelling, albeit not immediately abutting the application site save for the northeastern-most corner, are the grounds associated with the Grade II* Listed Building of the Manor House. This listed boundary also forms the line of the identified Glington Conservation Area which the application site sits adjacent to but not within. The Conservation Area contains a number of important listed and locally listed buildings, including the Grade I St Benedicts Church.

Proposal

The application seeks outline planning permission for the construction of 14no. dwellings of which 4no. plots are for custom/self-build dwellings. At this time, 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

No relevant planning history.

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

The Local Planning Authority has a statutory duty to have special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

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.

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

Section 6 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Paragraph 14 sets out that development proposals that accord with the development plan should be approved without delay and that where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

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 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 11 - Development on Agricultural Land

Where deemed necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be used in preference to that of a higher quality.

Section 11 - Biodiversity

Development resulting in significant harm to biodiversity or in the loss of/deterioration of irreplaceable habitats should be refused if the impact cannot be adequately mitigated, or compensated. Proposals to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be permitted and opportunities to incorporate biodiversity into new development encouraged.

Development within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest or other specified sites should not normally be permitted where an adverse effect on the site's notified special interest features is likely. An exception should only be made where the benefits clearly outweigh the impacts.

The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where development requiring Appropriate Assessment under the Birds or Habitats Directives is being considered or determined.

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 authorities should assess the significance of any heritage assets that may be affected by particular proposals, including any effect on setting.

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.

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.

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.

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.

Peterborough Site Allocations DPD (2012)

SA04 - Village Envelopes

These are identified on the proposals map. Land outside of the village envelope is defined as open countryside.

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.

Self-Build and Custom House Building Act 2015 (as amended)

Section 2(1) - Local Planning Authorities must have regard to the register when carrying out planning duties (including determining planning applications).

Section 2A(2) - A Local Planning Authority must give suitable development permission in respect of enough serviced plots of land to meet the need arising in each base period.

Peterborough Design and Development in Selected Villages SPD (2011)

Glinton Conservation Area Appraisal Report and Management Plan (2009)

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 took place between December 2016 and 9 February 2017. The responses are currently being reviewed. At this preliminary stage only limited weight can be attached to the policies set out therein.

4 Consultations/Representations

PCC Conservation Officer (11.09.17)

Objection - The proposed development would harm the significance of the Glinton Conservation Area and the Grade I Listed Church through inappropriate development within their setting. This would therefore be contrary to Sections 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. The level of harm would be less than significant, and as such paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework should be engaged.

PCC Tree Officer

No comments received

Building Control Manager

No comments received

Archaeological Officer (07.08.17)

No objections - Aerial photographs show the presence of ridge and furrow within the proposed development site. Although further to the south investigations have failed to reveal any features other than medieval cultivation remains, Iron Age, Roman and Saxon features and/or finds are documented within a 500m radius area. It is possible that features of these periods may survive within the application area, being masked by the later, medieval ridge and furrow. As the site has witnessed no major development, if present, potential buried remains are expected to survive in reasonably good conditions of preservation. Therefore, request evaluation by trial trenching is secured by condition.

PCC Pollution Team

No comments received.

PCC Peterborough Highways Services (21.08.17)

No objections - The proposed access is on the outside of a bend and therefore benefits from reasonable visibility in both directions on Peakirk Road. The road has a 30mph speed limit so the required visibility splays should be achievable and therefore the access proposals are acceptable to the local highway authority. The development will not result in excessive amounts of additional trips on the network with less than 10 vehicle movements in each of the peak hours based on accepted trip generation ratios for residential developments.

However, the development is not considered sustainable in transport terms as nigh on all the trips to and from the site will be by car and Glinton does not have the full range of services to cater for residents' requirements. The site is on a bus route however services run every 3 hours and the nearest bus stop is 850 metres away which is not suitable for future occupants.

It would be sensible for the development to improve the footway to a wider standard where possible to accommodate for cycles and mitigate against the remote location. This could be secured by condition.

PCC Senior Recreation Officer

No comments received.

PCC Travel Choice (04.08.17)

No comments - The proposed development is not large enough to warrant a Travel Plan.

PCC Strategic Housing (10.08.17)

No comments - As this application is for less than 15 homes, there is no affordable housing requirement.

Lead Local Drainage Authority (25.09.17)

No objections - Following submission of additional information, the inclusion of permeable paving and infiltration techniques to manage the surface water onsite is welcomed. It is understood that Welland and Deeping IDB have provided an in-principle agreement to connect to their watercourse if infiltration onsite proves undeliverable. Accordingly, content for the surface water drainage for the site to be secured by condition.

Waste Management (01.08.17)

Comments - As there are areas of the development in which the waste collection vehicle will be required to manoeuvre a 3 point turn, it is vital that suitable tracking is provided to show the vehicle can access these turns safely. Also, the 'roundabout' road for plots 9-13 will not be accessed by the collection vehicle. A suitable bin collection point for a minimum of 2 bins (plus food waste caddy) per property will need to be provided as close to the turning head (yet not exceeding 25m pulling distance for residents) as possible.

PCC Wildlife Officer (22.08.17)

No objections - Pleased to note that this application is accompanied by an Ecological Survey Report (May 2017) and am satisfied with the report's assessment of impacts on protected species. The proposal involves the removal of vegetation (to create a new site access) which may support nesting birds. Therefore recommend that the standard bird nesting informative be included on any decision, and a scheme of bird boxes be secured by condition as mitigation.

The hedgerow and trees/shelterbelt along the roadside is, in part, recorded as being an "ancient hedgerow" and is likely to support associated birds and other wildlife. Therefore advise that this habitat is retained and any tree works kept to a minimum.

Request that the biodiversity enhancements set out within the submitted Ecological Survey Report be secured by condition.

Environment Agency (15.08.17)

No objections - Request a condition securing the provision of mains foul sewerage.

Police Architectural Liaison Officer (PALO) (04.08.17)

No objections - The design and layout is good and happy to support the Application. No further comments, objections or recommendations at this stage.

Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service (14.09.17)

No objections - Request that provision of fire hydrants be secured by condition or S106 legal agreement.

Glinton Parish Council (21.08.17)

Objection - The Parish Council resolved to object to the proposal on the following grounds:

- The proposed development is outside the village envelope.
- The site has not been approved in the current version of the Local Plan
- The proposed dwellings are incompatible with the results of the resident consultations as part of producing the emerging Neighbourhood plan
- The village requires 2 & 3-bed "affordable homes"

In addition to the parish council views, residents spoke of their concerns as follows:

- Questioning the ability of the existing sewer networks, already unable to cope in the area.
- Particular concern regarding any further development and the potential for the village being "overdeveloped" with a loss of a rural identity

- Concerns about the loss of wildlife and residents were of the opinion that the landscape should be retained.

GeoPeterborough (Sites Of Interest)

No comments received.

Historic England (24.08.17)

No comments - Suggest you seek the views of your specialist conservation and archaeological advisors.

Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 11

Total number of responses: 5

Total number of objections: 4

Total number in support: 0

A total of 3no. objections have been received from local residents on the following grounds:

- The proposal lies outside the village boundary of Glington.
- Many aspects of the proposal are contrary to the recommendations in the Glington Village Neighbourhood Plan - Interim Consultation Document (Section 1.4).
- The proposal would add a further circa fifty residents and circa twenty cars to an already 'crowded' village. There have been three other recent planning approvals in the village which is already congested in the mornings and at night at the crossroads, and this will further add to those problems. The access onto the Peakirk Road, near the entrance to Clarendon and the road bend running towards Peakirk, will be dangerous for the many school children on their bikes and on foot in the mornings and evenings.
- The local amenities of schools and medical facilities are also already full so I (resident of Pembroke Grove) do not understand why it would be a good idea to add to the existing problems.
- I (resident of Peakirk Road) purchased my house last year on the outskirts of the village because of its closeness to the open fields surrounding the village, the view from the front of the house, the quietness of its non-estate locality, the notable lack of permission to develop in this area and the overall village feel.
- This proposal does not promote sustainable development, it does increase the number of houses, obviously, but fails to increase them in a location that can sustain them without further development to the village infrastructure to support what could be more than 60 more people and probably 30 additional cars.
- The application dismisses the Glington Neighbourhood Plan as being not progressed to a stage where it can be given material weight in decision making. I (resident of Peakirk Road) believe the Plan is suitably developed and recognises that any additional housing should be built on any small unused plots already within the boundary of the village and not as is sort here, too extend the village boundary.
- In order to maintain the village feel, Glington should not be developed any further. It is far more practical to build additional housing in nearby Werrington which has the infrastructure to be able to sustain it and the design to be able to accommodate it without spoiling the surrounding area.
- The proposed site is on a bus route. This service does not provide an efficient service to Peterborough with buses only running every 2.5 - 3 hours, not a peak travel times and taking nearly an hour to get in to town so to state that it provides options for local travel other than the private car is misleading.
- The shape of the east side of the village has remained unchanged since the 1930's with good reason. This is a small village that stands alone from the surrounding villages and should remain like this.

- The application is for all two storey houses. The proposed site is opposite what is predominantly bungalows and is therefore not in keeping with its surroundings.
- Policy CS2 identifies Glinton as a suitable location for limited new residential growth. This development is not what I (resident of Peakirk Road) would class as limited. It will increase the burden on what is already an overstretched infrastructure and should not be permitted.

In addition, one neutral representation has been received which raises the following:

- The plan to remove 'invasive' plants such as bramble and nettle, and the valuation of the historic pollard as 'poor' are disturbing. The presence of these items are invaluable to the arthropod community and increase the potential of the belt of overgrown hedge a great deal. The pollard is vital for the slower-growing beetles which depend on dead wood. Peacock, Red Admiral and Small Tortoiseshell butterflies depend on nettles as their food plant, and Buff Arches, Peach Blossom and Fox moths require bramble as theirs, and of course, birds and small mammals will eat the berries. Dead and dying trees support an enormous variety of life, from fungi, mosses and lichens to insects such as the Stag Beetle and various hoverflies, and other arthropods -many of which are now threatened/endangered due to our tendency to 'clean up' areas close to housing. Therefore, these features should be retained as much as possible to prevent harm to wildlife.

5 Assessment of the planning issues

The main considerations are:

- Principle of development
- Impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area
- Impact upon heritage assets
- Access and highway implications
- Neighbour amenity
- Ecology and trees
- Drainage

a) Principle of development

Settlement hierarchy

As set out in Section 1 above, the application site is located outside the identified settlement boundary of Glinton and is therefore within the open countryside. Policy CS1 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) clearly states that development within the countryside will be restricted either: to that which is demonstrably essential to the effective operation of local agriculture (or other related uses/rural enterprises); or whereby it satisfies the 'exception' test set out in policy CS8 of the Core Strategy.

In this instance, the proposal seeks private open market dwellings which have no tie or relevance to existing local rural enterprises/agricultural etc. Accordingly, it fails the first relevant part of the above policy. In addition, the proposal does not meet the exception test of Policy CS8. This test would only be met if the site is otherwise suitable for residential development in the light of all other policies in the development plan; and a specific local need for affordable housing has been demonstrated, over and above that which could be met through the 30% normal requirement; and the proposed development would provide affordable housing of a number and type which meets (or contributes towards meeting) the local need. As no affordable housing is currently proposed, the development in no way meets the exceptions test and fails the second relevant part of Policy CS1.

On this basis, the principle of residential development on this site is not considered to be acceptable and the proposal is contrary to Policies CS1 and CS8 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011).

Five year housing land supply

Under the provisions of paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), Local Planning Authorities are required to have, and be able to, demonstrate a five year supply of housing. As Members will recall, the Council's five year land supply was recently tested on appeal in relation to a proposal for 80 units on the edge of Barnack (application 15/01840/OUT). The Inspector in upholding this appeal and granting planning permission concluded, on the basis of the evidence presented to him, that the Council was, at that time, unable to robustly demonstrate a five year land supply (the supply available being somewhere between 3.80 years and 4.75 years).

This current application has been submitted in the context of this appeal decision and further challenges the Council's five year housing land supply.

However, following the appeal decision and during the consideration of this application, the Council has published an updated Five Year Housing Land Supply report (published 5 July 2017) based upon the Council's Housing Monitoring Report from March 2017 (which sets out all sites under construction, with full or outline planning permission at 31 March 2017) and also includes sites identified as proposed allocations in the Further Draft Local Plan.

This report identifies, that between 1 April 2017 and 31 March 2022 (the current five year period), there is a requirement for 5,241 new dwellings. From the evidence provided, the report sets out that the Council is able to demonstrate that 6,516 dwellings are capable of being delivered. Accordingly, 1,275 additional dwellings can be demonstrated over the five year period which equates to a housing land supply of 6.22 years, well in excess of the 5 year requirement under the NPPF.

Accordingly, for the purposes of determining this current application, the policies contained within the adopted Local Plan (i.e. CS1 and CS8 set out above) can be considered relevant and up-to-date.

Self-build and custom housing

The application proposal includes the provision of 4no. self-build plots. Whilst there are no specific details regarding how these plots will be brought forward, it is assumed that they would be sold as serviced plots and are therefore proposed to meet the Council's duties under the Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 (as amended).

This Act requires that the Council maintain a register of individuals/associations of individuals who are seeking to acquire serviced plots of land in the authority's area in order to build houses for those individuals to occupy as homes. Further, the Act requires (Section 2(1) refers) that Local Planning Authorities have regard to this register when determining planning applications and, (Section 2A(2) refers) that they grant sufficient developments planning permission to meet the demand identified on the register within each 'base period'.

The Council presently has a register of individuals/associations of individuals seeking serviced plots for self-build/custom housing and this is into its second 'base period'. During the first (to 30 October 2016), the register identifies a need to 4 serviced plots. The current base period, which will end on 30 October 2017, identifies that a further 14 serviced plots are required. Accordingly, at present, there is a registered demand for 18 serviced plots within the administrative area of Peterborough.

In line with the Act, it must be acknowledged that the current proposal would go in some way to meeting the demand set out on the register and, the 4no. plots proposed would entirely meet the demand arising within the first base period. This therefore weighs in favour of the proposal.

However, the Act allows for this demand to be met within a period of 3 years starting with the end of the base period. Accordingly, the Council has until 30 October 2019 to provide 4no. plots and to 30 October 2020 to provide the additional 14. Whilst it is acknowledged that this is not a considerable period of time, Officers consider that it is sufficient to allow for alternative proposals to meet the demand, which are acceptable in all other material planning considerations (unlike the current proposal as set out below), to come forward. It is considered that there should not be a pressure to accept the current proposal, which is contrary to other adopted Local Plan policies, simply because of this duty.

Furthermore, the Act does not override the requirement for the application to be assessed against the policies contained within the adopted Local Plan and other material planning considerations. Accordingly, it is one consideration which must be weighed against all other matters and is not an automatic presumption in favour of granting permission.

b) Impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area

The established form of Glinton comprises a historic village core, with ribbon development radiating along the four main routes into/out of the village. The application site is located off one such route – Peakirk Road to the east. It is acknowledged that more extensive development, not in a ribbon form, has taken place to the south of Peakirk Road, infilling the village outwards towards the A47. However the northern side of Peakirk Road, where the application site is situated, has not been subject to this degree of development. The built form of the village on this northern side extends to the eastern line of the gardens/grounds associated with the Grade II* Listed Manor House, with no further encroachment beyond into the open countryside. Whilst Glinton has been subject to considerable change in the post-war period, this eastern boundary of the built form has not altered.

Further, when approaching the village from the east (from Peakirk), owing to the soft landscaping which is present along not only Peakirk Road but also the eastern boundary of the village, there is no hard boundary to the open countryside. There is currently a relatively soft transition which respects the rural character of the locality.

It is considered that the proposal, which would introduce built form beyond this existing eastern boundary of the village, would represent unacceptable sprawl of the village. The proposal would erode the open countryside beyond the village and represent an incongruous and alien form of development to the traditional historic character of this part of the village. In addition, the two storey form of the dwellings (as proposed), irrespective of any soft landscaping and material quality which may be secured, would appear an obvious and obtrusive feature on this village edge, representing a stark contrast to the open countryside beyond.

Furthermore, along Peakirk Road, the built form comprises plots of single depth (i.e. no backland dwellings), with relatively large detached dwellings fronting onto the public highway. Whilst there is some setback to these dwellings, these are all open gardens and not subject to tall or dense hedgerow/shelterbelt. In addition, the dwellings are all of single or one and a half storeys in height, appearing of modest size and scale. There is considerable variety to the design, appearance and palette of materials however the overall form of the streetscene is relatively uniform.

Whilst the layout and appearance of the proposed dwellings is reserved at this time (i.e. for determination at a later date), due consideration must be given to whether the number of dwellings proposed could be acceptably accommodated. The submitted indicative site layout does identify that the number of dwellings proposed could be accommodated within the site however this would be in a form, layout and arrangement which would be wholly at odds with this established character of the streetscene. To construct 14no. dwellings on the site, frontage development along the public highway could not be achieved and as such, the layout would appear contrived and incongruous introducing what appears to be backland development where none presently exists. This, in combination with the significantly differing height/form of the dwellings, would result in undue harm to the character of the streetscene.

On this basis, it is considered that the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the character, appearance and visual amenity of the surrounding area which would be contrary to Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and Chapter 8 'Glington' of the Peterborough Design and Development in Selected Villages SPD (2011).

c) Impact upon heritage assets

Designated heritage assets

As detailed in Section 1 above, whilst the application site is not located within the identified Glinton Conservation Area, it is located adjacent to the eastern boundary. This Conservation Area contains a number of important listed buildings, as well as those which are designated at a local level. Furthermore, the curtilage and grounds associated with the Grade II* Listed Manor House abut the application site to the north-east. Under the provisions of Sections 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, there is a statutory duty to ensure that all new development either preserves or enhances the features for which these assets have been designated. This is further reinforced through both national and local planning policies, which attach significant weight to this need.

As the proposal may impact upon both the Conservation Area and a Grade II* Listed Building, Historic England are a statutory consultee. They have advised that they do not wish to offer any comments in respect of the proposal, and have deferred to the professional advice of the Council's own heritage Officers.

The City Council's Conservation Officer has raised objection to the proposal as he considers that the proposed development would result in unacceptable harm to the setting of both the Glinton Conservation Area and the Grade I Listed Church located within it (some 435 metres to the west).

Glington is situated in a relatively flat landscape, with views towards the village only restricted by trees and the prominent view being of St Benedict's church rising above the settlement, characteristic of fenland villages. Public vantage points of the site and the village are gained from the tree lined public footpath leading from Peakirk Road which runs along the frontage of the application site. The adopted Glinton Conservation Area Appraisal highlights the importance of this approach, and identifies that this eastern side of the village can be described as one of the least altered views of the village.

It is the view of the Conservation Officer that the existing development along Peakirk Road is well screened in views from the footway, by way of the dense boundary treatment between the rear gardens and the southern boundary of Manor House. The ribbon development of the village extends further on the south side of Peakirk Road than the north, but is largely screened from this direction. Distant views of the church rising above the trees within the village are possible and this is seen in the context of green soft landscaping. This view is significant in that it depicts the rural nature of the settlement and provides an important setting for the Grade I listed church.

It is considered that the proposed development would have a significant impact on these views, which are currently dominated by the outbuildings of Manor House and the Church's spire. The proposed two storey dwellings would result in a prominent and obtrusive addition to the edge of the village, appearing a stark suburban intrusion into the soft setting of the Conservation Area. This would significantly detract from the current, well-preserved historic eastern entrance into the village and the dwellings would interrupt and detract from key views towards the Church spire.

Accordingly, it is considered that the proposal would harm the significance of the Conservation Area and the Grade I Listed Church through inappropriate development within their setting, contrary to Sections 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Policy CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012). As the harm that arises is considered to be 'less than significant', paragraph 134 of the NPPF requires that the benefits of the proposal be weighed against the harm. Given the considerable weight that is attached to the preservation of designated heritage assets, it is considered that this harm outweighs the relatively limited benefits of the proposal.

Archaeology

The City Council's Archaeologist has advised that the application site is likely to contain relatively undisturbed buried archaeology. Aerial photographs show the presence of ridge and furrow within the proposed development site. Although further to the south investigations have failed to reveal any features other than medieval cultivation remains, Iron Age, Roman and Saxon features and/or finds are documented within a 500 metre radius area of the site. As such, the Archaeologist considers that it is possible for features of these periods to have survived within the application site.

To ensure that no harm to, or loss of, these potential undiscovered buried heritage assets, the Archaeologist has requested that evaluation by trial trenching be secured by condition. This is considered appropriate and necessary to ensure that the development accords with paragraph 128 of the NPPF, Policy CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

d) Access and highway implications

Access

At this time, the access into the proposed development is sought and therefore must be fully considered. It is proposed for a new vehicular access to be created from the northern side of Peakirk Road, approximately 17 metres in from the western boundary of the site. This access would be of a typical 'estate' design, proposed to be 6 metres in width with 2 metre wide footways to either side. The Local Highway Authority (LHA) has advised that this access would be safe, of sufficient width and is capable of providing adequate vehicle-to-vehicle visibility. Accordingly, the LHA considers that this access is acceptable and would not pose a danger to highway safety.

With regards to traffic generation, the LHA has advised that the proposed 14no. dwellings would, in line with established and accepted trip generation rates for residential development, generate 10 additional movements per peak period (i.e. 10 additional movements in both the morning and afternoon peak periods). The LHA raises no objections to this and it is considered that the existing highway network is capable of accommodating this additional traffic without undue harm arising. It is noted that one of the local objectors has raised concerns with regards to existing congestion, both within the village and at key junctions, being exacerbated by the additional traffic arising from the proposed development. These concerns are noted and it is accepted that more vehicles would pass through the village. However, the LHA have advised that in their view this would not be unacceptable and accordingly, Officers do not feel that a reason for refusal on this basis could be sustained.

On this basis, it is considered that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact to the safety of the surrounding public highway network, or result in an unacceptable level of traffic. Accordingly, the proposal is in accordance with Policy PP12 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

Sustainability

Notwithstanding the above, the LHA has raised concerns with regards to the remote location of the application site, and the lack of available methods of travel other than the private car. The site is located at the outer eastern edge of Glinton, categorised in the Local Plan as a Limited Growth Village. This categorisation was, in part, owing to the relatively few services and facilities within the village, including public transport. Whilst a bus service does operate and serve Glinton, it runs every 3 hours and cannot be considered a frequent or regular route. Further, the nearest bus stop to the site is situated some 850 metres to the west, which in the view of the LHA is too far to be usable for future occupants of the development. Accordingly, occupants of the development would be almost entirely reliant on private cars to access the wider services/facilities they would need. Accordingly, it is considered that the proposal fails to achieve accordance with the Peterborough transport plan, and represents inappropriate development in an unsustainable location, contrary to Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011).

Finally, it is noted that the LHA has advised that, as mitigation for this unsustainable location, the footway running westwards from the site to the bus stop, could be upgraded to accommodate cycles as well as pedestrians. This is noted however to achieve this shared space would result in a foot/cycleway of considerable width. It is considered that this would result in an unacceptable erosion of the soft verdant landscaping of the Conservation Area and therefore would not be appropriate solution to the harm arising from the development.

e) Neighbour amenity

Given that the layout and appearance of the proposed dwellings are reserved at this time, it is not possible to undertake a comprehensive assessment of the impact upon neighbour amenity. However, it is considered that the site is of sufficient size to ensure that adequate levels of separation are provided to No.29 Peakirk Road so as to not result in unacceptable levels of overshadowing, overbearing or overlooking impact. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to the amenities of neighbouring occupants, and is in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

f) Ecology and trees

As set out in Section 1 above, the majority of the site is presently part of a larger arable agricultural field which has been subject to intensive farming for a number of years. It is bound to the south by a mature and dense hedgerow/shelterbelt which encloses the entire field to the southern and eastern boundaries.

In terms of the ecological impacts arising from the development, the application has been accompanied by an Ecological Survey Report dating from May 2017 and the City Council's Wildlife Officer has advised that the assessment and conclusions contained therein are accepted. This Survey does not identify any protected species as being present within the site, or within proximity to it, and concludes that subject to appropriate mitigation (through native planting, bird boxes, hedgehog gaps in fences and enhancement of an adjacent pond), no undue harm to biodiversity would result from the development.

Notwithstanding and in addition to these suggested mitigation measures, the Wildlife Officer has strongly advised that the existing hedgerow/shelterbelt should be retained (with the exception of the proposed access) as it is likely to support associated birds and other wildlife. For the reasons set out below, Officers are concerned that the retention of this landscape feature could not be secured and accordingly, net harm to biodiversity may result.

The retention of this landscape feature is also strongly advised by the City Council's Tree Officer who has raised objection to the proposal. At present, the hedgerow is offered protection by virtue of the Hedgerow Regulations 1998 which means that if any of it were to be removed, an application to the Local Planning Authority would need to be made and could ultimately be refused. If permission were to be granted for the proposed development, the Hedgerow Regulations would no longer apply as hedgerows adjacent to residential gardens are exempt. As the hedgerow/shelterbelt is outside of the Conservation Area and, in the view of the Tree Officer, the trees as individuals and as a group are not to the standard where a defendable Tree Preservation Order could be served, there is no statutory protection that could be afforded to the feature.

Officers are also concerned that to impose any condition upon a planning permission requiring the retention of the feature in perpetuity, could not be defended at appeal as it may not be deemed to be reasonable. Further, the site is not of sufficient size in which to secure this area as Public Open Space to be adopted by the Council, as the number of dwellings proposed could not be acceptably accommodated on the remaining land. Accordingly, Officers consider that there is no means by which this hedgerow/shelterbelt could be secured in the long-term.

There is concern that, by virtue of the size of the site and the number of dwellings proposed (as indicated on the submitted indicative site layout), there would be considerable future pressure from occupants to heavily prune or fell this shelterbelt owing to constant growth of weeds, shading of gardens and apprehension. It is noted that the Applicant proposes the retention of this feature however there does not appear to be any secure mechanism to achieve this. Accordingly, without protection, this key landscape feature, which is of significant value to the overall amenity and biodiversity offer of the locality, would be lost. On this basis, the proposal would be contrary to Policy CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

h) Drainage

The application proposes to deal with surface water run-off by means of soakaways however at this time, no soakage testing results have been provided. Notwithstanding this, the City Council's Drainage Engineer has confirmed that no objections are raised in this regard, as confirmation has been provided from the Welland and Deeping internal Drainage Board (IDB) that they would accept any run-off from the site into their network in the event that soakaways are not achievable. Accordingly, the Drainage Engineer has advised that, subject to securing a detailed scheme by condition, surface water drainage can be adequately managed from the site so as to not pose an unacceptable flood risk to future or existing occupants. Accordingly, the proposal is in accordance with Policy CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011).

With regards to foul water drainage, it is noted that concern has been raised to the parish Council that the sewage network would not have capacity to accommodate the development. Both Anglian Water and the Environment Agency have raised no objections in this regard, however both have requested a condition requiring the provision of a foul sewage scheme. This is considered necessary and reasonable to ensure that suitable water infrastructure is secured.

i) Other matters

With regards to other matters raised by objectors but not discussed above:

Neighbourhood Plan – As the Neighbourhood Plan has not yet been through public examination, it cannot be afforded any weight in the consideration of this application.

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 reasons:

- R 1 The application site is located outside the identified settlement boundary of the Limited Growth Village of Glinton, and is therefore within the open countryside. The proposal seeks 10no. open market dwellings and 4no. self-build plots, with no affordable housing provision. The proposal would therefore fail to meet with the exception provisions contained within Policy CS1 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), which strictly controls development within the open countryside, and is unacceptable in principle.
- R 2 The proposal, by virtue of its location, size, scale and form, would result in an unacceptable erosion of the eastern boundary of the village of Glinton. The proposal would generate suburban encroachment into the open countryside, which degrades the established form and character of the village. Furthermore, the development would be wholly at odds with the established pattern of development along Peakirk Road, and the dwellings by virtue of their height, form and layout, would appear alien and incongruous within the streetscene. The proposal would therefore result in unacceptable harm to the character, appearance and visual amenity of the surrounding area, contrary to policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).
- R 3 The proposal, by virtue of its location, size, scale and form, would result in a prominent and obtrusive addition to the edge of the village, appearing a stark suburban intrusion into the soft setting of the Conservation Area. This would significantly detract from the current, well-preserved historic eastern entrance into the village and the dwellings would interrupt and detract from key views towards the Grade I Listed Church spire. Accordingly, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the fail to preserve the setting of the Grade I Listed Church through inappropriate development, Policy CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).
- R 4 The proposed dwellings would be located within a Limited Growth Village, which is not well-served by all of the services and facilities needed for everyday living. This includes a lack of adequate bus service, with the closest bus stop located a considerable distance from the application site. Accordingly, the proposal would result in unsustainable development which is unduly reliant on travel by private car and fails to accord with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011).
- R 5 Whilst the layout of the site is not secured at this time, by virtue of the number of dwellings proposed and the constraints of the site in terms of its size, the proposal would likely result in significant future pressure to prune and/or fell the hedgerow/shelterbelt which runs along the southern boundary of the application site. There are no adequate mechanisms which could secure this landscape feature which is of key amenity value to the surrounding area, and whose loss would result in unacceptable harm to the biodiversity of the site. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policy CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

This page is intentionally left blank