

Development Control Committee 2 October 2019

Planning Application DC/19/1329/FUL – Land off Pippin Post Close, Stansfield

Date Registered:	09.07.2019	Expiry Date:	08.10.2019
Case Officer:	Jo-Anne Rasmussen	Recommendation:	Refuse Application
Parish:	Stansfield	Ward:	Whepstead and Wickhambrook
Proposal:	Planning Application - (i) 5no. dwellings (ii) public open space (iii) community orchard and associated landscaping (iv) associated access and parking		
Site:	Land off Pippin Post Close, Stansfield, Suffolk		
Applicant:	H E Dennis & Son Limited		

Synopsis:

Application under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Associated matters.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Committee determine the attached application and associated matters.

CONTACT CASE OFFICER:

Jo-Anne Rasmussen

Email: Jo-Anne.Rasmussen@westsuffolk.gov.uk

Telephone: 01284 757609

Background:

The application is before the Development Control Committee, as the Officers' recommendation is one of REFUSAL contrary to the view of the Parish Town Council and the concerns raised by the local Ward Member, Councillor Mary Evans.

Proposal:

1. Planning permission is sought for five dwellings with associated access, parking and landscaping. A community orchard is also proposed as part of the scheme.

Application Supporting Material:

2. Site location plan
Landscaping plan/details
Floor Plans and elevations
Proposed block plan
Arboricultural Impact Assessment
Biodiversity Survey and report
Design and Access Statement
Heritage Statement
Landscape and visual impact assessment (LVIA)
Contamination report
Planning statement
Statement of community involvement
Sustainable drainage strategy
Transport assessment
Details of house types (private/affordable)

Site Details:

3. The site is situated to the south of Pippin Post Close on land which is currently undeveloped countryside. To the north and east of the site are residential properties. To the south and west are further agricultural fields within the same ownership. The site is not within the settlement boundary for Stansfield and is therefore on land classified as countryside.

Planning History:

4. None relevant

Consultations:

5. Parish: Support with the following comments;
 - Supports the principle of affordable housing, subject to it meeting local need.
 - The Parish would like a S106 agreement in place to ensure a local connection criteria is used to rent out the affordable housing units.
 - Supports the community open spaces
 - Would like additional visitors parking to be provided to prevent visitor parking on Pippin Post Close.
 - There should be good access for emergency vehicles.

- Drainage conditions set out in the drainage report should be complied with.
- 6. Planning Obligations Officer: The site falls as a Major as defined by the NPPF and as such 30% affordable housing is required under Policy CS5. 30% of 5 units is 1.5 units.
- 7. Housing: Does not support the application.
The scheme could not be supported as an exception scheme.
The affordable housing does not meet the definition given within annexe B of the NPPF as they have not appointed a registered provider to manage the rented dwellings. The community survey is not sufficient to demonstrate a local need.
- 8. Public Health and Housing: No Objections subject to conditions
- 9. Environment Team: No Objection subject to conditions
- 10. Highways: No Objections subject to conditions

Representations:

- 11.19 letters of representation were received 15 Objected whilst 4 were in support of the proposal.

Objections;

Sustainability of the site;

The site is outside of the village boundary

Site not sustainable.

The countryside should be protected from inappropriate development

Future occupiers would be reliant on private car. No school, doctors or amenities within the village. Few public transport links. Nearest schools and doctors are over-subscribed.

Brownfield/alternative site preferred.

A number of sites around the village have been bought by developers and could come forward if this is approved. Potential for future developments in the countryside. The development could set a precedent for further similar development.

Housing;

Local questionnaire relating to housing is misleading and over 3 years old.

Survey inadequate and insufficient to demonstrate local need. Lack of local support for more housing

Given the style/ design of properties the affordable units may still not be affordable.

Design/ visual impact;

Visual Impact doesn't adequately show impact upon residents.

5 houses would be a significant increase in housing given the size of the village

Design of properties is not in-keeping with the surrounding built vernacular.

Highways safety;

Increase of traffic on narrow road surrounding the site
Blind bend/dangerous junction onto Pippin Post Close.
Difficulties for emergency services accessing the site and neighbouring properties
Roads surrounding Stansfield are inaccessible and have accident black spots with hazardous junctions.
Increase of traffic from surrounding villages.
Increased traffic will have a detrimental impact upon cyclists and walkers.
Occupiers of existing houses on Pippin Post Close park on the road.
Ancient right of way through field.

Impact upon neighbour amenity;

Loss of privacy/ enjoyment of garden. Increase of traffic and noise. Loss of view. Devaluation of property
Negatively impact upon the quiet nature of the village.

Detrimental impact upon the health of neighbour who has existing medical conditions – noise/disturbance, impact upon access from additional parking and traffic. Potential disruption to services.

Support ;

Support the application for more housing to allow people to stay in the village.
Current housing unaffordable so support affordable housing.
There needs to be more affordable housing for younger people who live and work in the village.

Policy:

12. On 1 April 2019 Forest Heath District Council and St Edmundsbury Borough Council were replaced by a single Authority, West Suffolk Council. The development plans for the previous local planning authorities were carried forward to the new Council by Regulation. The Development Plans remain in place for the new West Suffolk Council and, with the exception of the Joint Development Management Policies document (which had been adopted by both Councils), set out policies for defined geographical areas within the new authority. It is therefore necessary to determine this application with reference to policies set out in the plans produced by the now dissolved St Edmundsbury Borough Council.
13. The following policies of the Joint Development Management Policies Document and the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy 2010 & Rural Vision 2031 have been taken into account in the consideration of this application:
 - Policy DM1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
 - Policy DM2 Creating Places Development Principles and Local Distinctiveness
 - Policy DM7 Sustainable Design and Construction
 - Policy DM22 Residential Design
 - Policy DM13 Landscape Features

- Policy DM14 Protecting and Enhancing Natural Resources, Minimising Pollution and Safeguarding from Hazards
- Policy DM27 Housing in the Countryside
- Policy DM46 Parking Standards
- Core Strategy Policy CS1 - St Edmundsbury Spatial Strategy
- Core Strategy Policy CS2 - Sustainable Development
- Core Strategy Policy CS3 - Design and Local Distinctiveness
- Core Strategy Policy CS4 - Settlement Hierarchy and Identity
- Core Strategy Policy CS7 - Sustainable Transport
- Core Strategy Policy CS13 - Rural Areas
- Vision Policy RV3 - Housing settlement boundaries
- Vision Policy RV1 - Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development

Other Planning Policy:

14. National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

The NPPF was revised in February 2019 and is a material consideration in decision making from the day of its publication. Paragraph 213 is clear however, that existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of the revised NPPF. Due weight should be given to them according to their degree of consistency with the Framework; the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework; the greater weight that may be given. The policies set out within the Joint Development Management Policies have been assessed in detail and are considered sufficiently aligned with the provision of the 2019 NPPF that full weight can be attached to them in the decision making process.

Officer Comment:

15. The issues to be considered in the determination of the application are:

- Principle of Development
- Impact upon the form and character
- Impact upon neighbouring properties
- Affordable housing
- Ecology
- Highways
- Other material planning considerations

Principle of development

16. The proposed development comprises 5 new dwellings and a community orchard. The site is not situated within the settlement boundary of Stansfield and is therefore on land classified as countryside.
17. Policy CS4 identifies the settlement of Stansfield as an Infill Village. Such villages have a limited range of services, and only infill development comprising single dwellings, or small groups of five dwellings or fewer will normally be acceptable within the settlement boundary. Policy CS13 further states that development permitted in such locations will only be so much as is necessary, reflecting the need to maintain the sustainability of services in the community they serve, and the provision of housing for local needs. Development outside the defined settlements within CS4 will be strictly controlled, with a priority on protecting and enhancing the character, appearance, historic qualities and biodiversity of the countryside while promoting sustainable diversification of the rural economy.
18. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires applications for planning permission to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Recent High Court cases have reaffirmed that proposals that do not accord with the development plan should not be seen favourably, unless there are material considerations that outweigh the conflict with the plan. This is a crucial policy test to bear in mind in considering this matter since it is not just an absence of harm that is necessary in order to outweigh any conflict with the development plan, rather tangible material considerations and benefit must be demonstrated.
19. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and is a material consideration in planning decisions. Paragraph 12 of the NPPF is clear however that the Framework does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. Proposed development that accords with an up-to-date Local Plan should be approved, and proposed development that conflicts with such should be refused unless other material considerations indicate otherwise.
20. West Suffolk Council has a 5 year housing supply and therefore, its policies for the supply of housing (including settlement boundaries) are considered up-to-date and are material considerations in the determination of this application, (para 11 NPPF). The Council has a 6.3 year supply of housing including a 5% buffer.
21. Policy DM5 further provides that areas designated as countryside will be protected from unsustainable development and sets out the circumstances where new or extended buildings will be permitted. In terms of housing, policy DM5 supports the principle of affordable housing, dwellings for key agricultural, forestry or equine workers, small scale development in accordance with policy DM27, and the replacement of existing dwellings on a one-for-one basis. It is not considered the proposal would accord with any of the provisions within DM5 which look to allow sustainable development within the countryside.

22. Policy DM27 permits up to two dwellings on small undeveloped plots within otherwise built up frontages in existing clusters of 10 or more houses. The development is for 5 new dwellings and is not considered to be situated within an otherwise built up frontage. The development is not considered "in-fill" development and does not accord with DM27.
23. Policy DM29 sets the criteria for rural housing exception sites. The proposal includes two "affordable housing" units with 3 private units. DM29 would in exceptional circumstances allow a small number of private market homes where it can be demonstrated that these are necessary to facilitate the delivery of the affordable units, no such argument has been presented by the applicant and this development is not being presented as an exception site. As such the proposal fails to accord with DM29.
24. Stansfield is classed as an infill village and therefore has limited facilities necessary for day to day living such as a school or doctors. Public transport routes to larger settlements are limited. It is therefore likely that any future occupiers would be largely dependent upon private car to access services and facilities.
25. As the proposed dwellings would be located in the countryside and do not meet any 'exceptional circumstance' as envisaged in the Core Strategy and set out in Policies DM5, DM27 and DM29 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document, it is considered that the proposal undermines the planned strategy for housing supply, and the protection of the countryside, contained in the Development Plan taken as a whole. Whilst the National Planning Policy Framework aims to boost housing supply significantly, this is to be achieved in a sustainable way following a genuine plan led approach, which in this case is primarily set out in policies CS4 and CS13 of the Core Strategy and DM5 and DM27 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document. On the contrary, the provision of five dwellings outside of the settlement boundary, and noting that Stansfield is designated as an infill village with only a very modest range of services, further suggests that this is an unsuitable and a more unsustainable location for a new dwelling.
26. The increase to housing stock made by 5 additional houses is noted as is the community orchard/ public open space. As detailed above, local and national policies aim to protect the countryside and steer housing to appropriate sustainable locations. Therefore whilst the proposal could be said to increase housing within the village, this is an argument that could be applied to many sites in this and nearby settlements which would lead to significant unplanned development of the countryside. It is not considered the provision of a community orchard could be awarded such significant weight to outweigh the clear and identified harm to the countryside and conflict with the development plan.
27. Officers consider that there are no material considerations cited which outweigh the clear and significant conflict with the development plan in this case. These facts weigh very heavily, and fundamentally, against the scheme in the balance of considerations.
28. The principle of development is therefore contrary to the Development Plan. Accordingly, notwithstanding consideration of any matters of detail,

this policy conflict is considered to be a very notable weight against the proposal, and sufficient to justify refusal on its own.

Impact upon the form and character

29. DM2 looks for new development to achieve a high quality design and seeks to maintain a sense of place and local character. Policy CS3 looks for all new development to create and contribute to a high quality environment which illustrates an understanding and regard for the local context.
30. Policy DM13 (Landscape Features) states that development will be permitted where it will not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the character of the landscape, landscape features, wildlife or amenity value.
31. Policy DM22 states that residential development proposals should maintain or create a sense of place and/or character by utilising the characteristics of the locality to create buildings and spaces that have a strong sense of place and distinctiveness, using an appropriate innovative design approach and incorporating a mix of housing and unit sizes that is appropriate for the location.
32. Properties to the east of the site which fall within the settlement boundary of Stansfield are set relatively closely together and form a tighter knit, typical of a village of this nature. The site is undeveloped land bound largely by post and rail fencing and natural vegetation and is quite clearly visually distinct from the built character of the settlement. Land to the south and west is undeveloped countryside. There is a recognised change in the built character of the development, with the area within the village boundary being distinctly different to this undeveloped area of countryside on the edge of the settlement. The established settlement boundary for Stansfield serves to ensure that the rural setting and character of the settlement is protected. Whilst the LVIA looks to identify limited views of the site within the wider landscape, the undeveloped nature of the site adds positively to the character of Stansfield. The provision of 5 unjustified domestic units and associated domestic paraphernalia in this location would undermine the undeveloped nature of this countryside location resulting in an urbanising intrusion which would have a detrimental impact upon the character of the countryside.
33. It is noted that the design ethos of the properties is to draw similarities and be in a style similar to agricultural buildings. However the grouping of the properties is not in-keeping to that of a traditional farmstead nor how agricultural buildings would characteristically be found within the landscape. Nor would such agricultural buildings have the associated domestic paraphernalia and parking associated with residential properties. As such it is not considered the design of the properties would be sufficient to outweigh the level of harm upon the landscape character of the countryside and settlement.
34. Permission for five new dwellings on this site would serve to undermine policies in place to protect the countryside from this type of urbanising development, with similar arguments being applied to many other sites within the village and surrounding settlements which would result in significant unplanned and incremental expansion of the rural settlement. The proposal would result in an encroachment to the countryside, which is

distinctively visually separate from that which is present within the Housing Settlement Boundary. The provision of the proposed dwellings would intrude into this open countryside setting, to the detriment of the landscape character and rural character of Stansfield and as such would be contrary to policies DM2, DM22, and DM13 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015.

Affordable Housing

35. Owing to the size of the site, contributions towards affordable housing are necessary. Policy CS5 requires such developments to provide 30% affordable units and as such the proposal would be required to provide 1.5 units.
36. Policy DM29 makes provision for exceptions sites in the countryside and states as an exception to the provision made in the Core Strategy for general housing demand, the local planning authority will permit rural affordable housing schemes in the district adjoining but outside a Housing Settlement Boundary or built up area provided that:
- a. the development will meet or assist in meeting a proven and specific need for affordable housing in the locality which could not otherwise be met;
 - b. the development is on the edge of a Key Service Centre, Local Service Centre, or Infill Village and is well related to existing community services and facilities and sympathetic to the form and character of the settlement;
 - c. the site is the most suitable to meet the identified need and, in particular, the need could not be met on any site which would better meet criterion b.;
 - d. the development will not negatively impact on biodiversity, geodiversity or the surrounding landscape character. Any unavoidable harm to the natural environment will be adequately mitigated; and
 - e. secure arrangements are made to ensure that initial and subsequent occupation of the dwellings can be restricted to those having an identified local need for affordable housing through the use of appropriate safeguards, including conditions or legal obligations.
- In exceptional circumstances, a small number of market homes will be permitted where demonstrated to be essential to facilitate the delivery of affordable units.
37. Criteria a. requires there to be a proven and specific need for affordable housing in the locality which is achieved by conducting a housing needs study or by analysing data from the housing register. The applicant has relied on a community survey conducted by Stansfield Parish Council in 2016. The Housing Officer has stated that this is not enough to demonstrate the need for affordable housing in the village. Establishing the need would help to guide how many and what type of dwellings should be built. The community survey was not a full housing needs study and Appendix 1 does not give sufficient detailed evidence to support an exception scheme in Stansfield. Housing Register data confirms three applicants indicating a local connection to Stansfield which is not enough need to support an exception scheme.

The development is not being brought forward as an exception scheme. Three of the units proposed are provided as market dwellings. The Planning Statement suggests this will help to enable the delivery of the

affordable units. Policy DM29 does allow a small number of market homes to be permitted in exceptional circumstances where demonstrated to be essential to facilitate the delivery of affordable dwellings. No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate the market homes are essential to facilitate the two affordable dwellings. As such the proposal fails to accord with the provision and aims of DM29. Furthermore, the type of housing being proposed on this development does not meet the definition within Annex 2 of the NPPF;

NPPF Annex 2 classifies affordable housing as housing for sale or rent, for those whose needs are not met by the market [...] and which complies with one or more of the following definitions:

a) Affordable housing for rent; b) Starter homes; c) Discounted market sales housing; and d) Other affordable routes to home ownership.

Annex 2a definition of affordable housing to rent says that development must meet all of the following conditions:

(a) the rent is set in accordance with the Government's rent policy for Social Rent or Affordable Rent, or is at least 20% below local market rents (including service charges where applicable);

(b) the landlord is a registered provider, except where it is included as part of a Build to Rent scheme (in which case the landlord need not be a registered provider); and

(c) it includes provisions to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households, or for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision. For Build to Rent schemes affordable housing for rent is expected to be the normal form of affordable housing provision (and, in this context, is known as Affordable Private Rent).'

38. The planning statement states two of the five proposed dwellings will be offered as affordable rent (to be let at 80% of the open market value) and will be owned and let by the applicant as opposed to a registered provider. However, the applicant is not a registered provider and as the proposal does not fall under the definition of a build to rent scheme which are a mix of affordable private rent and private market rent properties.

39. **Annex 2b** Starter Homes are defined in Sections 2 and 3 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016 [...]

"starter home" means a building or part of a building that— (a) is a new dwelling, (b) is available for purchase by qualifying first-time buyers only, (c) is to be sold at a discount of at least 20% of the market value, (d) is to be sold for less than the price cap, and (e) is subject to any restrictions on sale or letting specified in regulations made by the Secretary of State.

Information provided in the planning statement does not evidence the proposed dwelling could fall under the category of a starter home.

40. **Annex 2c** definition of discounted market sales housing is that sold at a discount of at least 20% below local market value. Eligibility is determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices. Provisions should be in place to ensure housing remains at a discount for future eligible households. The planning statement gives no indication that a 20% discount against the district valuer's valuation of the property is going to be applied and nor that the applicant will enter into a legal agreement to ensure the property remains at a discount in perpetuity when sold.

41. **Annex 2d** definition of other affordable routes to home ownership is housing provided for sale that provides a route to ownership for those who could not achieve home ownership through the market. It includes shared ownership, relevant equity loans, other low cost homes for sale (at a price equivalent to at least 20% below local market value) and rent to buy (which includes a period of intermediate rent). Where public grant funding is provided, there should be provisions for the homes to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households, or for any receipts to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision, or refunded to Government or the relevant authority specified in the funding agreement. The planning statement does not provide any evidence that other affordable routes to home ownership are being considered.
42. The proposed Affordable units do not meet the definition of affordable as set out by Annex 2 of the NPPF. The development would be required to provide a minimum of 1.5 affordable units which it fails to do. Further to this the applicant has failed to provide sufficient justification to identify a local need for such housing. As such the proposal fails to accord with the provisions of Policy DM5 and DM29.

Impact upon neighbour amenity

43. The closest dwelling to the site is 2 Pippin Post Close which abuts the northern boundary of the site. Unit one is located 14 metres from the common boundary with 2 Pippin Post Close. There is an existing hedgerow to the boundary which landscaping plans illustrate would be reinforced. There are a number of windows to the northern elevation of unit one, including a bedroom and kitchen window. However given the separation distance and single storey nature of the dwelling it is not considered the proposal would have an adverse impact upon neighbour amenity in terms of overlooking, overbearing impact or overshadowing. Given the separation distances from the units to other properties along Pippin Post Close and fronting onto the High Street it is not considered the development would negatively impinge upon the amenity of the occupiers.
44. Whilst concerns have been raised by neighbours as to loss of privacy to their front gardens from the additional traffic and people visiting the site and community orchard the front garden areas of such properties are generally more open where a large degree of privacy would not be expected.
45. Whilst regard is given to the personal circumstances of one of the residents near to the site, however given the distance of this property from the site is not considered any significant dis-amenity would occur. Whilst noise may be heard during the construction phase this is not in itself a reason to prevent development, nor is the increased noise from traffic visiting the housing once built.

Highways

46. Policy DM46 requires that development have appropriately designed and sited parking areas to limit unsafe parking within the street scene. Proposals should accord with the adopted standards, in this instance the Suffolk Guidance for Parking 2019 adopted by Suffolk County Council.

47. Highways have stated that the highway leading to the site, Pippin Post Close, is wide enough for two cars to pass and further that the crashmap indicates that the area surrounding the site has had no reported accidents between 1998 and 2018.
48. Highways have stated that Public Footpath 16 Stansfield is aligned adjacent to the south western boundary of the site and would not be directly affected other than the creation of a new link to it from the development.
49. Highways have not objected and have stated that there are no highway safety reasons why the proposal should be refused. Two parking places are provided for each dwelling which meets the standards within the Suffolk Guidance for Parking, 2019. Taking the above into account it is considered the proposal would not have a detrimental impact upon highway safety and would comply with DM46.

Ecology

50. Policy DM12 requires development to include measures within the design for the protection of biodiversity and the mitigation of any adverse impacts. Additionally, enhancement for biodiversity should be included in all proposals, commensurate with the scale of the development.
51. An Ecological Appraisal was provided as part of the application. This concluded that "providing the avoidance, precautionary methods, as detailed in Section 5, are implemented, to protect any potential species that may be using parts of the site, the development of the site can proceed with negligible impact on any protected species or locally important species. Providing the proposed opportunities to enhance the site as detailed in the landscape design are incorporated into the proposed development then the site has the potential to be enhanced from its current state. Thus delivering a net biodiversity gain."
52. Section 5 states that the landscaping which would enhance the biodiversity of the site would include;
 - A new native-species hedgerow is proposed around the perimeter of new dwellings.
 - Planting of boundary trees
 - Planting of a small area of fruiting trees
 - Reinforcing field boundary hedgerow.

The site itself is currently undeveloped countryside with vegetation to the boundaries. Whilst the ecological appraisal indicates that there will be a biodiversity gain there is no evidence to suggest that this would be significant considering and when balanced against the level of domestication of the site that would occur. Whilst the benefit to ecology can be given some weight it is not considered that this would be sufficient to outweigh the urbanising impact this development would have upon the countryside and the conflict with policies designed to protect the countryside from such unjustified and unsustainable development. DM12 requires all development to include biodiversity enhancements and as such the proposal would be compliant with this policy.

Other material planning considerations

53. Policy DM7 states proposals for new residential development will be required to demonstrate that appropriate water efficiency measures will be employed. No specific reference has been made in regards to water consumption. Should permission be granted a condition could be included to ensure that either water consumption is no more than 110 litres per day (including external water use), or no water fittings exceeds the values set out in table 1 of policy DM7.

Conclusion:

54. The application site lies outside of a defined settlement boundary and is therefore within the countryside where the provision of new housing is strictly controlled. The exceptions are set out under policies DM5, DM27 and DM29 of the Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Local Plan Joint Development Management Policies Document (February 2015), these being affordable housing for local needs in accordance with other policies, dwellings for rural workers, small scale infill development of one or two dwellings, and the replacement of an existing dwelling. Whilst the application includes a community orchard, some ecological benefits and two "affordable units" these are not considered to outweigh the identified harm to the countryside from this unjustified development. The affordable units fail to meet the definition given within the NPPF and as such the proposal fails to provide the minimum number of affordable units as required by CS5.

55. In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and paragraph 12 of the NPPF, the development plan is the starting point for decision making and proposals that conflict with the development plan should be refused unless other material considerations indicate otherwise. As set out earlier in this report, officers are of the opinion that there are no material considerations that indicate that policy should be set aside in this case.

Recommendation:

56. It is recommended that planning permission be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

Reason 1:

The site falls outside of any defined settlement boundary and is therefore within the countryside where the provision of new housing is strictly controlled. The exceptions for new housing in the countryside are set out under policies DM5, DM27 and DM29 of the Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Local Plan Joint Development Management Policies Document (February 2015), these being affordable housing for local needs in accordance with other policies, dwellings for rural workers, small scale infill development of one or two dwellings, and the replacement of an existing dwelling. The affordable units proposed do not meet the definition given within annex 2 of the NPPF. The proposal would not represent any of these exceptions. There are no material planning considerations which would outweigh this significant conflict with policy and as such the proposal is considered contrary to Policies DM1, DM5, DM27 and DM29 of

the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, CS1 and CS4 of the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy 2010 and the guiding principles of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (NPPF).

Reason 2:

The proposed development being outside of the settlement boundary would lead to an encroachment into the countryside which would negatively impact upon the rural character of the site and the village of Stansfield. There are no material considerations which would outweigh the significant harm caused by an unjustified and unsustainable development in the countryside and conflict with the development plan. The proposal would be contrary to Policies DM2, DM5, DM13 and DM22 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, CS1 and CS3 of the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy 2010 and the guiding principles of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019(NPPF).

Reason 3:

Policy CS5 requires such developments to provide 30% affordable units for a site of this size and as such the proposal would be required to provide 1.5 units. The proposed affordable units do not meet the definition of affordable set out by Annexe 2 of the NPPF. The development would be required to provide a minimum of 1.5 affordable units which it fails to do. Further to this the applicant has failed to provide sufficient justification to identify a local need for such housing. As such the proposal fails to accord with the provisions of Policy DM5 and DM29 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, CS5 of the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy 2010 and the guiding principles of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (NPPF).

Documents:

All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online [DC/19/1329/FUL](https://www.stedmundsbury.gov.uk/DC/19/1329/FUL)