Wheatman Planning Limited
Beacon Innovation Centre
Beacon Park
Gorleston
Norfolk
NR31 7RA

Date Of Decision: 22 May 2013
Development: Erection of 64 Dwellings with Associated Garages and Amenity
Work together with Public Open Space
Location: Land off Wyngates, Blofield, NR13 4JG
Applicant: Norfolk Homes Ltd

Town & Country Planning Act 1990

The Council in pursuance of powers under this Act REFUSES PLANNING PERMISSION for the development referred to above for the following reasons:-

This application has been considered against the Development Plan for the area, this being the Broadland District Local Plan (Replacement) 2006 and the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk 2011. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is also a material consideration.

The following policies are particularly relevant to the determination of the application: GS1 and HOU1 of the Broadland District Local Plan (Replacement) and Policies 4, 7, 9, 12, 13 and 14 of the Joint Core Strategy.

The approval of up to 64 further houses in Blofield would, taking account of existing approved estate scale housing development, represent an increase in population of about 33% and would represent a significant increase in the size of the settlement being about 5.2 times the level of 50 dwellings referred to in Policy 14 of the Joint Core Strategy. It is considered that development at this overall scale would undermine the spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy of the Joint Core Strategy and would fundamentally alter the existing character of Blofield as the consequential scale and form of development would not be commensurate with the size of settlement. Therefore, the scale of development, when taking account of existing estate scale housing commitment in Blofield, is excessive and not commensurate with this Key Service Centre - a third order settlement - and is contrary to Policy 14 of the Joint Core Strategy.

The cumulative impact of development of this scale is exacerbated by the speed of delivery (the site must be deliverable if it is to contribute towards the 5 year housing supply). Such a significant influx of growth over a relatively short period of time will be difficult to assimilate into the community and is likely to lead to a disparity between the local population and local facilities and services.
It is considered that further estate scale housing development in the village, in addition to
the approval of up to 197 dwellings, would result in a housing commitment commensurate
with a higher order settlement such as a Main Town (defined in Policy 13 of the Joint Core
Strategy) and would not be suitable for this small third order settlement.

This is turn means the proposed development is not commensurate with the social and
economic needs of the settlement of Blofield which therefore renders it an unsustainable
location being at odds with these two dimensions referred to in para 7 of the NPPF. Adverse impacts on these dimensions should be avoided (para 152 of the NPPF) and the
alternative option to reduce or eliminate such impacts should be allowed to take place by
allowing the location of further housing growth to be plan-led and to be determined through
the Site Allocations DPD.

The cumulative scale of the proposal is premature in respect of the preparation of the Site
Allocations DPD and the overall scale of housing development that would result in this
third order settlement if this proposal were to be approved the effect of this would be to
predetermine decisions about the scale and location of new development in other third
order or higher order settlements which ought properly to be addressed in the emerging
Site Allocations DPD.

Approval of the proposal would see a disproportionate amount of the development for the
district being undertaken in one area, contrary to the spatial vision of the JCS which seeks
to distribute housing growth following a settlement hierarchy.

Approval of the proposal, in light of the existing quantum of estate scale housing approvals
in Blofield, would undermine the very core planning principles of both plan-making and
decision taking at odds with para 17 of the NPPF.

It is considered that approval of this application would prejudice the plan-led system and in
doing so the impacts associated with the proposal as outlined above would be both
significant and demonstrable and these would not be outweighed by any benefits in the
current proposal.

The Local Planning Authority will, where appropriate, discuss amendments to applications
to secure an acceptable and sustainable form of development. However, in this instance it
is not considered that the scheme could be amended to overcome the 'in principle'
concerns of the Authority. The Authority has therefore acted accordingly to refuse this
inappropriate development.

Signed

[Signature]

Mr P Courtier
Head of Planning
Broadland District Council, Thorpe Lodge, 1 Yarmouth Road, Thorpe St Andrew, Norwich,
NR7 0DU
Information relating to appeals against the decision of the Local Planning Authority.

If you are aggrieved by this decision to refuse permission for the proposed development or to grant it subject to conditions, then you can appeal to the Secretary of State under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Any appeal must be made within 6 months of the date of this notice unless an enforcement notice has been served for the same or substantially the same development within the period of two years before this application was made, or subsequently, then the period within which an appeal can be lodged is reduced to 28 days from the date of this decision or 28 days from the serving of the enforcement notice, whichever is the later.

The Secretary of State can allow a longer period for giving notice of an appeal, but he will not normally be prepared to use this power unless there are special circumstances which excuse the delay in giving notice of appeal.

Appeals must be made using a form which you can get from the Planning Inspectorate at Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol BS1 6PN or online at www.planningportal.gov.uk/pcs.

The Secretary of State need not consider an appeal if it seems to him that the local planning authority could not have granted planning permission for the proposed development or could not have granted it without the conditions they imposed, having regard to the statutory requirements, to the provisions of any development order and to any directions given under a development order.

In practice, the Secretary of State does not refuse to consider appeals solely because the local planning authority based their decision on a direction given by him.

Purchase Notices

If either the local planning authority or the Secretary of State refuses permission to develop land or grants it subject to conditions, the owner may claim that he can neither put the land to a reasonably beneficial use in its existing state nor render the land capable of a reasonably beneficial use by the carrying out of any development which has been or would be permitted.

In these circumstances, the owner may serve a purchase notice on the District Council in whose area the land is situated. This notice will require the Council to purchase his interest in the land in accordance with the provisions of Part VI of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.