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1. Introduction

The Application

1.1. This Planning Statement has been prepared by Savills (UK) Ltd on behalf of David Wilson Homes (Eastern) (the Applicant) to support an application for full planning permission on land east of Holt Road, Horsford (the Application Site) for the (the Proposed Development):

“Erection of 259 dwellings, together with associated public open space, landscaping, highways and drainage infrastructure works.”

Format of this Statement

1.2. This Statement is structured as follows:

- Section 2 describes the background to the Proposed Development, with reference to the Development Plan and housing land supply;
- Section 3 describes the Application Site and its surroundings;
- Section 4 describes the Proposed Development;
- Section 5 sets out the sustainability credentials of the Proposed Development, discusses the economic, social and environmental benefits and explains why the proposal constitutes ‘sustainable development’;
- Section 6 provides an assessment against the various applicable planning policies;
- Section 7 considers matters pertaining to the use of planning conditions, obligations and CIL to mitigate the impact of the Proposed Development; and
- Section 8 provides a brief summary of the key points and overall conclusions.

1.3. This Statement should be read in conjunction with the various application and supporting drawings and including the following:

- Proposed Site Layout
- Design and Access Statement
- Statement of Community Engagement
- Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment
- Phase 1 Contamination Assessment Report
- Landscape Strategy, Landscape Masterplan and Landscape Management Plan
- Ecological Report
- Arboricultural Report (including Tree Surveys)
- Site-Specific Flood Risk Assessment Report
- Transport Assessment
- Foul Sewerage & Utilities Assessment
- Topographical Survey
2. Background to the Proposed Development

Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

2.1. One of the ‘Core Planning Principles’ set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF / the Framework) is that planning should:

“...proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs”.

2.2. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF / the Framework) explains that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of ‘sustainable development’. It sets out (para. 14) a ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’.

2.3. Planning permission is sought for the Proposed Development to address a shortfall in local housing supply on a sustainable site in a sustainable location.

2.4. The Framework requires (para. 47) that each Local Planning Authority ensure that there are specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years’ worth of housing. At present, in the area including the Application Site, there is only 4.91 years’ worth of supply (this point is discussed later in this Section).

2.5. Where there is not a 5 year supply of housing land, the Framework states (para. 49) that policies relating to the supply of housing – for example settlement boundaries, should be considered out-of-date; thus less weight can be given to them in the consideration of a planning application.

2.6. In such circumstances the Framework requires (para. 14) that planning permission 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”.

2.7. This Statement explains why the Proposed Development is sustainable development, that there are no adverse impacts that would ‘significantly and demonstrably’ outweigh the benefit of granting planning permission, and thus why planning permission should be granted.

Need for Housing

2.8. The reason why there is a need for additional housing in Horsford and the surrounding area can be summarised as follows:

- People are living longer and the population is growing.
- House prices in and around Norwich are rising and affordability is worsening. Prices in Horsford have more than doubled in the last 20 years and risen by around 25% in the last five years alone.
In large part, this increase in house prices is driven by the supply of housing failing to keep up with the increase in demand. Between 2008 and 2015, only 916 new homes were built in the local area, against a requirement for 4,317 – just over 21% of what was required.

It is increasingly difficult for people to afford to buy or rent their own home.

Increasing the supply of housing is one way of addressing this worsening of affordability.

The Government has thus asked local authorities to boost significantly the supply of housing.

Horsford is recognised as a sustainable location, with a good range of services and facilities – this is why the Council has sought to direct new residential development to the village.

The Development Plan

2.9. Section 70 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 together require that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the statutory Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

2.10. Insofar as it relates to the Application Site and the Proposed Development, the statutory Development Plan comprises the following:

- Joint Core Strategy (JCS) (as amended) (2014), prepared by Broadland, South Norfolk and Norwich City Councils working together as the Greater Norwich Development Partnership (GNDP)
- Broadland Site Allocations (SA) DPD (2016)

2.11. The Council has also recently adopted a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) ‘Recreational Provision in Residential Development’, the requirements of which are discussed later in this Statement.

2.12. Also relevant is the Norfolk Core Strategy and Minerals and Waste DM Policies DPD (2011), which sets out the spatial vision for future mineral extraction and associated development and waste management facilities in Norfolk. However, the Application Site is not subject to, nor is affected by any minerals and waste designation.

Joint Core Strategy

2.13. The JCS sets out the vision, objectives and spatial development strategy for Broadland, South Norfolk and Norwich for the period up to 2026. The JCS establishes (Policy 4) a housing requirement 36,820 homes to be delivered across Broadland, South Norfolk and Norwich between 2008 and 2026 with a focus on delivery within the ‘Norwich Policy Area’ (NPA).

2.14. Policy 4 also specifies that 11,099 homes should be delivered in Broadland District, again with a focus on delivery within the NPA, which includes Horsford.
Broadland Development Management DPD

2.15. The DM DPD sets out a range of policies against which all planning applications would be considered. The requirements of these policies are discussed in more detail later in this Statement.

Broadland Site Allocations DPD

2.16. The SA DPD allocates sites across the District that are suitable for certain forms of development including housing, employment and community facilities.

Horsford

2.17. Site HOR1 is allocated for the development of 63 dwellings and employment (class B1, B2, and B8 uses) at the former Pinelands Industrial Estate. The site was the subject of a detailed planning application which received permission in March 2011 (LPA ref: 20100774) and the majority of dwellings have now been constructed.

2.18. Site HOR2 is allocated for the development of 125 dwellings and open space at Mill Lane, Horsford. The site was the subject of a detailed planning application which received permission in April 2014 (LPA ref: 20130547). The site is known locally as ‘Butterfly Mill’ and is currently under construction with David Wilson Homes anticipating completion of the new homes in 2016.

Five Year Housing Land Supply Position

2.19. As mentioned, LPAs should identify a 5 year supply of specific deliverable housing sites. The JCS sets the requirements for housing delivery within Broadland and separates this into two distinct areas: the NPA and the Rural Area.

2.20. At paragraph 47 the Framework sets out the expectations on maintaining a 5 year supply for LPAs. In addition to being able to demonstrate 5 years worth of housing against the adopted housing requirement, it also requires an additional buffer of 5%. The Framework states that this is to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. However, where Local Authorities have persistently under-delivered housing against the housing requirement, the buffer should be increased to 20%. As there has been a persistent shortfall in housing delivery within the Broadland part of the NPA (with just over 21% - 916 out of 4,317, of the required dwellings having been delivered during the period 2008/09 to 2014/15), the 20% buffer is applicable. This was agreed by the Inspector that considered the SA DPD.

2.21. The ‘Annual Monitoring Report for Broadland, Norwich, and South Norfolk 2014-15’ (AMR) set out the latest housing land supply position for each of the Districts. For Broadland, the AMR states (para. 3.87 / Appendix A2) that the 5 year supply in the Broadland part of the NPA is 3.11 years (a supply of 3,266 dwellings against a requirement for 5,245 dwellings).

2.22. The AMR goes on to state that if the sites included in the SA DPD are taken into account, the 5 year supply in the Broadland part of the NPA is 5.14 years (a supply of 5,396 dwellings against a requirement for 5,245 dwellings).
2.23. However, these calculations do not apply the 20% buffer to the shortfall in supply to date. This point was considered by the SA DPD Inspector, who concluded that the buffer should also be applied to the shortfall.

2.24. On this basis the 5 year housing land supply for the Broadland part of the NPA as identified in the 2014-15 AMR is as follows (figures are rounded):

**Five Year Housing Land Supply Calculation (AMR 2014-15)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JCS annual requirement:</td>
<td>617</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortfall to date:</td>
<td>(4,317 - 916)</td>
<td>3,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annualised shortfall over remaining 11 years:</td>
<td>(2015/16 to 2025/26)</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCS annual requirement plus annualised shortfall:</td>
<td>(617 + 309)</td>
<td>926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffer applied to JCS annual requirement:</td>
<td>(20% of 617)</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCS annual requirement (+ buffer) plus annualised shortfall:</td>
<td>(926 + 123)</td>
<td>1,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 year requirement:</td>
<td>(1,049 x 5)</td>
<td>5,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>((5,396 / 5,245) x 5)</td>
<td>5.14 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Five Year Housing Land Supply Calculation (AMR 2014-15) (as per SA DPD Inspector)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JCS annual requirement:</td>
<td>617</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortfall to date:</td>
<td>(4,317 - 916)</td>
<td>3,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annualised shortfall over remaining 11 years:</td>
<td>(2015/16 to 2025/26)</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCS annual requirement plus annualised shortfall:</td>
<td>(617 + 309)</td>
<td>916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCS annual requirement plus annualised shortfall (+ buffer):</td>
<td>(916 + 20%)</td>
<td>1,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 year requirement:</td>
<td>(1,099 x 5)</td>
<td>5,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>((5,396 / 5,496) x 5)</td>
<td>4.91 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.25. JCS Policy 22 establishes a requirement for a review of the JCS in the event that there is a significant shortfall in the 5 year housing land supply affecting the Broadland part of the Norwich Policy Area. In acknowledgement of the housing land supply position, the GNDP has recently undertaken a Call-for-Sites exercise and commenced a review of the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP).

2.26. In the meantime, however, Broadland District Council (the Council) has to consider applications that are considered sustainable and to grant planning permission where it cannot demonstrate that there are no adverse impacts that would ‘significantly and demonstrably’ outweigh the benefit of granting planning permission.

2.27. The granting of full planning permission for the Proposed Development would make a significant contribution towards the shortfall in housing land supply in the Broadland part of the NPA and significantly boost what is currently an inadequate supply.

---

Emerging Local Plan

2.28. The GNDP has set out the following timescales for the production for the review of the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP):

- May to July 2016 – Call for Sites – complete
- October to December 2017 – Issues and Options Consultation
- June to July 2019 – Options Consultation
- October 219 – Submission
- June 2020 – Examination
- December 2020 – Adoption

2.29. The Applicant submitted information to the GNDP as part of the recent Call-for-Sites process to promote the Application Site for allocation within the emerging Local Plan.

2.30. Given that the emerging Local Plan is at a very early stage of preparation, only very little weight should be afforded to it.

Other Material Considerations

The Economic Aspect of Housing Delivery

2.31. Housing development is a key component of economic growth; this is recognised in Government policy and Ministerial guidance. Recent Government statements recognise the importance of housing development to achieving economic growth and recovery. In a press release dated 27th March 2015, issued by the Housing and Local Government Minister it was advised that:

"Housebuilding is a key part of the government’s long-term economic plan – and is at the heart of 3 bills that have received Royal Assent."

The Government’s Housing Strategy

2.32. The Government’s comprehensive housing strategy November 2011 (Laying the Foundations: A Housing Strategy for England) sets out measures “to support a thriving, active and stable housing market”.

2.33. Paragraph 11 on page viii of the Executive Summary states that:

“…getting house building moving again is crucial for economic growth” and gives as an example “for every new home built, up to two new jobs are created for a year”.

2.34. Paragraphs 4-8 of Chapter 1 of the document explain how housing development plays a significant role in economic growth, with paragraph 7 stating that:

“…every £1 million of new house building output supports 12 net jobs (seven direct and five indirect) for a year”.
2.35. The above Government statements and strategy set the context for the NPPF and highlight that the Government’s top priority is economic growth and that housing growth is an important part of this.

**Ministerial Statements**

2.36. ‘Planning for Growth’ – a Ministerial Statement made by Greg Clarke in March 2011 included the following statements which are of significance as background to this application:

   “...there is a pressing need to ensure that the planning system does everything it can to help secure a swift return to economic growth...The Government’s top priority in reforming the planning system is to promote sustainable economic growth and jobs...LPAs should support enterprise and facilitate housing, economic and other forms of sustainable development...”

2.37. ‘Housing and Growth’ – a Ministerial Statement made by Eric Pickles, 6 Sept 2012 included the following statements, also highly relevant as background to this application:

   “We must create the conditions that support local economic growth...there is far more to do to provide homes to meet Britain's demographic needs and to help generate local economic growth...The need for new homes is acute, and supply remains constrained.”

**National Planning Policy Framework**

2.38. The NPPF sets out the Government's policy on planning. It reiterates (paras. 11-12) that planning law dictates that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the statutory Development Plan unless material consideration indicate otherwise. Paragraph 13 states that the Framework is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

2.39. The Framework states within its Foreword that the purpose of planning is to help achieve sustainable development. It explains (para. 6) that the policies within the Framework should be considered as a whole when identifying sustainable development.

2.40. Paragraph 7 identifies the three dimensions of sustainable development: economic, social, and environmental. Paragraph 8 advises that these are mutually dependant dimensions and that gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system.

2.41. Paragraph 17 sets out a series of underpinning Core Principles which seek to: proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business, infrastructure, and thriving local places that the country needs. To secure high quality design; take account of the different roles and character of different areas; whilst recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside; contributing to the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment; and promoting sustainable and accessible development.

2.42. Paragraph 186 advises that decision-taking should be approached in a positive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development whilst Paragraph 187 states that decision-takers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible seeking to secure developments that improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.
2.43. When assessing and determining applications, the NPPF advises Local Planning Authorities to apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development, which is described at Paragraph 14, in the context of decision taking, to be:

- approving development proposals that accord with the Development Plan without delay; and
- where the Development Plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless:
  - any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or
  - specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.

2.44. The Framework seeks to reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable modes of transport. Paragraph 32 establishes the relevant tests for decision takers when considering transport impact: whether safe and suitable access to the Application Site can be achieved by all people and that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.
3. Application Site and Surroundings

Horsford

3.1. The JCS identifies Horsford as a ‘Service Village’ within the NPA, with a good range of facilities that is considered capable of supporting additional residential development.

Table 1: Facilities in Horsford

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Distance from Application Site</th>
<th>Travel Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus Stop</td>
<td>0.6 km</td>
<td>7 min walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt Road (opposite Sandy Lane)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pub</td>
<td>1.1 km</td>
<td>13 min walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Brickmakers Arms, NR10 3ER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors Surgery</td>
<td>1.3 km</td>
<td>9 min (walk and bus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205 Holt Road, NR10 3DX</td>
<td></td>
<td>15 min walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School</td>
<td>1.5 km</td>
<td>18 min walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsford Church Of England Primary School, NR10 3ES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supermarket</td>
<td>1.7 km</td>
<td>22 min walk or 12 min (walk and bus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England Co-Operative, NR10 3AB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office</td>
<td>1.7 km</td>
<td>22 min walk or 12 min (walk and bus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149 Holt Road, NR10 3AB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>2.4 km</td>
<td>13 mins (walk and bus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsebeck Industrial Estate, NR10 3ED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td>7.2 km</td>
<td>33 min (walk and bus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellesdon High School, NR6 5SB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Approximate Distance and Travel Time taken from Google Maps.

3.2. There are bus stops 1.2 km away from the Application Site located on Holt Road at Sandy Lane (southbound) and Pinelands Industrial Estate (northbound), which are served by regular buses (Routes 36, 42, and 45(A&B)) providing public transport links from the Proposed Development to Norwich, Holt and surrounding settlements. However, a bus link is proposed through the Proposed Development that has the potential to bring bus services even closer to the proposed dwellings.

3.3. The nearest rail station is at Norwich Rail Station (10.22km). Trains from Norwich run to Cambridge, Lowestoft, Sheringham, Great Yarmouth, and London.
The Application Site

3.4. The Application Site comprises approximately 11.27 hectares (ha), mostly of relatively flat and level agricultural land situated to the north of Horsford, to the east of Holt Road, together with no. 360 Holt Road (also known as ‘Flagcutters’) and its curtilage.

Location

3.5. As noted above, the Application Site is well related to the village. To the west the Site is bordered by existing residential development fronting onto Holt Road, Olive Crescent and The Shrublands. To the south it is bordered by a residential development that is currently under construction (Local Plan site allocation reference HOR2 – ‘Land North of Mill Lane’, also known as ‘Butterfly Mill’) by the Applicant. To the north the Site is bordered by Green Lane, three individual dwellings and a small field. To the east it is bordered by agricultural land.

Agricultural Land Quality

3.6. The Application Site is of no greater agricultural value than that in the surrounding area; the Site is likely to be of moderate quality (sub-grade 3a or 3b) with much of the surrounding area being of similar quality with some pockets of good (grade 2) and poor quality (grade 4) land.

Landscape and Trees

3.7. There are stretches of existing hedgerow and tree vegetation around sections of the western and northern boundaries of the Application Site as well as two stretches of hedgerow and tree vegetation within the Site. The remainder of the western, northern and eastern boundaries are formed by a mix of fencing, with the southern boundary being formed by the northern boundary of the current, adjacent, residential development.

Ecology

3.8. The Application Site is not subject to any ecological designation, nor are there any statutory sites of nature conservation interest within 2 km of the Site; however there are 8 County Wildlife Sites within 2 km of the Site, one of which – Horsford Woods, lies immediately to the north of the Site, on the north side of Green Lane.

3.9. The Extended Phase 1 Habitat Assessment submitted in support of the application explains that the majority of the Application Site comprises cultivated agricultural (arable) land and improved grassland that has negligible to low biodiversity value. The scattered trees, hedges and dense scrubland is identified as having high to moderate biodiversity value.

3.10. In terms of protected species, parts of the Application Site were identified as being used by commuting and foraging bats – the Assessment includes a ‘bat scoping survey’.
Heritage

3.11. The Application Site does not contain nor forms part of any heritage asset, nor does it form part of the setting of any heritage asset.

3.12. The Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment submitted in support of the application highlights a moderate potential for archaeological remains on the Site due to the presence of significant archaeological remains within the local area. If considered appropriate by the Council a detailed geophysical survey and targeted trial trench evaluation could be required by condition to allow further assessment.

Potential for Contamination

3.13. As confirmed by the Phase 1 and 2 Geoenvironmental Assessments submitted in support of the application, the Application Site is not contaminated.

Drainage

3.14. As confirmed by the Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment submitted in support of the application, the Application Site is situated within Flood Zone 1, the least at risk of flooding.

Access

3.15. There is an existing access to the Application Site from Green Lane – an unclassified road. There are no other public rights of way either on or adjacent to the Site.

Utilities

3.16. The Foul and Sewage and Utilities Assessment submitted in support of the application details the relevant matters relating gas, electric and potable water supply, and foul sewage.
4. **The Proposed Development**

**Description of Development**

4.1. The application seeks full planning permission for the:

"Erection of 259 dwellings, together with associated public open space, landscaping, highways and drainage infrastructure works."

4.2. The existing dwelling – no. 360 Holt Road, would be retained, thus there would be a total of 260 dwellings on the Application Site once the Proposed Development is completed.

4.3. The ancillary buildings within the curtilage of no. 360 are all to be demolished.

**Access**

4.4. The main access to the Application Site would be from Green Lane, with the stretch of the Lane between Hot Road and the access being improved. At the site access the improved road would lead into the Site Application Site and a T-junction formed with the remainder of Green Lane extending to the east.

4.5. The cross-roads junction of Green Lane, Holt Road and Haveringland Road would be reconfigured to become a staggered cross-roads.

4.6. A 2m-wide pedestrian footway would be created from the Application Site via the improved section of Green Lane to Holt Road, from where there is an existing footway leading to the centre of the village.

4.7. On the southern boundary of the Application Site, a bus link would be created to the adjacent residential development currently under construction, and a separate cycle / pedestrian link provided alongside. It is intended that a bus stop be provided within the Proposed Development at a location to be agreed.

4.8. Car parking and cycle storage is proposed in line with current planning policy.

**Layout and Landscape**

4.9. The layout of the Proposed Development features two parcels of residential development with a central area of public open space which would include a children’s play area.

4.10. A central spine road is proposed through the Application Site from the Green Lane access in the north to the bus link to the adjacent residential development to the south. Housing is proposed fronting onto this spine road, off which extend a number of smaller roads and private drives.

4.11. Additional planting is proposed around the periphery of the Application Site with significant areas of public open space and planting along the southern and eastern boundaries of the Site.

4.12. Pockets of incidental open space and planting are also proposed within the northern area of housing to provide visual interest and increased biodiversity.
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Amount and Scale of Development

4.13. The Proposed Development includes a range of house types and sizes from one-bedroom bungalows and maisonettes to five-bedroom detached houses.

4.14. It is proposed that 33% (85 dwellings) of the new dwellings would be “affordable” housing, including properties both for rent and discounted market sale. It is anticipated that detailed matters pertaining to the proposed affordable housing would be addressed during the consideration of the application.

Figure 1: Proposed Housing Mix (excluding no. 360 Holt Road)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>1 Bed</th>
<th>2 Beds</th>
<th>3 Beds</th>
<th>4 Beds</th>
<th>5 Beds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.15. The height of the proposed dwellings ranges from single storey bungalows to two storey houses. In reflection of the character of the surrounding area, no buildings taller than two stories are proposed.

Design

4.16. The overall and detailed of the Proposed Development has been informed through an evaluation of local context. The Design and Access Statement submitted in support of the application demonstrates how an attractive and well designed development would be achieved.

Infrastructure

4.17. The Proposed Development incorporates SuDS (Sustainable Drainage Schemes) – sustainable drainage measures designed to passively accommodate surface water drainage, including floodwater, without any impact on the Proposed Development or surrounding area. Individual building plots are proposed to have surface water from their roof and impermeable areas disposed of via permeable paving and individual soakaways. It is proposed that the highway surface water is disposed of via pipes in the highway areas which would then outfall into three separate soakaways across the Application Site in areas of public open space.

4.18. An electricity substation and a foul-water pumping station are proposed.

Environmental Impact Assessment

4.19. In response to a request for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Screening Opinion, the Council confirmed on 1st September 2016 that the Proposed Development was not considered to constitute EIA development (see EIA Screening Opinion attached to this Statement at Appendix 1).
5. Sustainability Credentials of the Proposed Development

Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

5.1. The NPPF has reinforced the long-standing underlying presumption in favour of (now, sustainable) development.

5.2. The Framework explains (para. 6) that the purpose of planning is:

“... to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development ...”

and advises that

“... the policies in paras. 18 to 219, taken as a whole, constitute the Government’s view of what sustainable development in England means in practice for the planning system”.

5.3. The Framework explains (paras. 7 and 8) that there are three mutually dependent dimensions to sustainable development:

- economic,
- social, and
- environmental.

5.4. The NPPF establishes (para. 14) that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, explains (para. 49) that housing applications should be considered in the context of this presumption, and (again para. 14) that where a proposal is demonstrated to be in accordance with the Development Plan, planning permission should be granted, without delay.

5.5. The NPPF further clarifies (para. 14) that where the Development Plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date (paras. 49, 211 and 215 provide advice in this regard), 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, when taken as a whole, or there are specific policies in the Framework that indicate that development should be restricted.

5.6. For the avoidance of doubt, there are no specific policies in the Framework that indicate that development of the Application Site should be restricted.

5.7. Para. 212 of the NPPF explains that the Framework is a material consideration in the determination of applications; thus even if a proposal is found to be contrary to the Development Plan, the presumption in favour of sustainable development outlined in the Framework has to be taken into account and if the proposal is sustainable development, this presumption weighed against the conflict with the Development Plan when deciding whether planning permission should be granted.
Economic Benefits

5.8. With regard to the economic dimension of sustainable development, the NPPF defines (para. 7) this as:

“... contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure”.

5.9. With regard to building a strong and competitive economy, the NPPF states (para. 18):

“The Government is committed to securing economic growth in order to create jobs and prosperity, building on the country’s inherent strengths, and to meeting the twin challenges of global competition and of a low carbon future.”

5.10. And continues (para. 19):

“The Government is committed to ensuring that the planning system does everything it can to support sustainable economic growth. Planning should operate to encourage and not act as an impediment to sustainable growth. Therefore significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system.”

5.11. To secure a strong rural economy the Framework further promotes (para. 28) the retention of local services and community facilities and advises (para. 55) that to promote sustainable development, housing should be located where it would enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.

5.12. The categorisation of Horsford as a Service Village identifies it as a sustainable location for development with a good range of services and facilities and good accessibility to public transport.

5.13. The Proposed Development would result in a range of positive economic benefits, including:

- An enlarged labour force of economically active residents;
- Additional household spending in the local area and thus the improved viability and vitality of local services and facilities;
- Additional demand for services and facilities that would directly support additional jobs in the local area;
- Investment in construction and support for construction jobs;
- New Homes Bonus for investment in local infrastructure and facilities; and
- Increased Council Tax receipts.

5.14. Hence, the requirements of paras. 18 and 19 of the NPPF are met, the economic dimension of sustainable development is achieved and that significant weight should be afforded to this.
Social Benefits

5.15. With regard to the social dimension of sustainable development, the NPPF defines (para. 7) this as:

“... supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being”.

5.16. The Proposed Development would result in a range of positive social benefits, including a mix of high quality additional market and affordable housing in a sustainable location with good public transport provision, thereby helping support local family connections and maintain a balanced community, additional space for play and recreation, sustainable drainage and habitat creation.

Housing

5.17. The Proposed Development would deliver social benefits again in the form of additional market and affordable housing, with the increased population reinforcing the vitality of the local community.

5.18. In relation to market housing in particular, the NPPF highlights (para. 55) that:

“... to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities”.

5.19. In relation to affordable housing, the NPPF highlights (para. 54) that:

“... local planning authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs, particularly affordable housing”.

5.20. Over the period 2008/09 to 2014/15 the average annual supply of housing in the District has been just over 130 dwellings per annum (dpa) compared to a target of 617 dpa. As a result there is a shortfall in supply of 3,401 dwellings.

5.21. This shortfall has served to constrain supply and thus increase house prices. The Proposed Development would help to counter this exacerbation of residential affordability by increasing supply.

5.22. The provision of new market and affordable housing should be afforded significant weight, even where a 5 year supply exists. In circumstances where there is not a 5 year supply, it should be afforded increased weight.

5.23. Thus the requirements of paras. 47, 50 and 55 of the NPPF are met and the provision of additional market and affordable housing represents a very significant benefit of the Proposed Development.
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Social Infrastructure

5.24. Through conditions, planning obligations and CIL, the Proposed Development includes all the necessary provisions to mitigate its impact on other community facilities and services, including education. In addition, the new residents would enhance the vitality and viability of Horsford and its existing services and facilities.

5.25. Thus the requirements of paras. 203 to 206 of the NPPF are met and the mitigation of impacts on social infrastructure, combined with the increase viability and vitality of existing services and facilities represents a minor benefit of the Proposed Development.

Transport

5.26. As demonstrated by its categorisation as a Service Village, Horsford is a sustainable location for new residential development. The Proposed Development would deliver new housing in a location where amenities within the village are within a reasonable walking distance.

5.27. Both existing bus stops and the new stop within the Proposed Development would be within walking distance of the new homes, thus promoting and supporting the use of sustainable modes of transport and hence conserving resources, reducing pollution and assisting with the move to a low-carbon economy.

5.28. Safe access to the Application Site can be provided and there would be no detrimental impact on the local highway network with junctions impacted upon having sufficient capacity to cope with the additional traffic generated.

5.29. The modest increase in traffic flows on the local highway network, albeit not to any material extent, which is itself outweighed by the sustainable location of the Application Site.

5.30. Hence the requirements of paras. 29 to 33 and 35 to 37 of the Framework are met, especially those of para. 32 and the mitigation of all impacts on the highway network, combined with the sustainable location of the Site, represents a moderate benefit of the Proposed Development.

Summary

5.31. In summary, other than a minor negative impact resulting from additional traffic, which is itself outweighed by the sustainable nature and location of the Application Site, the Proposed Development would deliver new market and affordable housing that would result in no other significant demonstrable harm to any social consideration, whilst delivering a wide range of positive social benefits that, with particular reference to delivery of new market and affordable housing, clearly outweigh the harm caused.

5.32. I thus consider that the social dimension of sustainable development is achieved and that significant weight should be afforded to this.
Environmental Benefits

5.33. With regard to the environmental dimension of sustainable development, the NPPF defines (para. 7) this as:

“… contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy”.

5.34. The Proposed Development would result in a range of positive environmental benefits including new tree and hedgerow planting and the creation of new additional ecological habitat.

Landscape and Visual Impact

5.35. As the Application Site is currently open agricultural land, it is acknowledged that there would be an adverse landscape impact as a result of the Proposed Development, as there is with any significant residential development on a greenfield site. However, in this case the Site is situated adjacent to existing residential development and is surrounded by woodland and tree belts that restrict long distance views of the Site. The proposed restriction on the height of the proposed dwellings to no more than two storeys, together with the proposed planting, would further limit the visibility of the Proposed Development and ensure that, in time, it is viewed in a similar manner to the existing part of the village.

Arboricultural Considerations

5.36. The Proposed Development retains much existing planting but it is acknowledged that there would be some loss of vegetation. The Arboricultural Report submitted in support of the application details the quality of the existing trees and hedgerows on the Application Site and assesses the impact of the Proposed Development on those that are to be retained. No trees of significance would need to be removed and whilst the Proposed Development would require the removal of some trees and sections of hedgerow, these losses consist of only five individual trees and some short sections of hedgerow.

5.37. In mitigation, a significant amount of planting is proposed as well as the provision of large landscaped areas of public open space that would, over the medium to long term, result in an increase in tree cover and amount of vegetation.

Flooding / Surface Water Drainage

5.38. The Flood Risk Assessment submitted in support of the application concludes that the Application Site can be adequately drained and that there would be no risk of flooding to the surrounding area.

Ecological Considerations

5.39. The Ecological Report submitted in support of the application notes that the Application Site is situated close to the South of Horsford Woods CWS but concludes that it is unlikely that, once built, the Proposed Development would result in increased disturbance to woodland wildlife.
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5.40. The change in terms of tree cover and other landscaping described above would be positive thereby serving to increase biodiversity.

Heritage Considerations

5.41. The Desk-Based Assessment submitted in support of the application concludes that the Proposed Development would not have any impact on any heritage asset.

5.42. The Assessment also concludes that the historic landscape character of the Application Site is of limited significance and although developing the Site would fundamentally change its character, this would not constitute an appreciable loss to the wider historic environment resource.

Traffic Impact

5.43. The Transport Assessment submitted in support of the application concludes that the Proposed Development would be in accordance with the aims and objectives of local and national transport planning policies and would not have a severe impact on the local transport network.

5.44. The design of the accesses to the Proposed Development have been tested and meet the necessary technical requirements.

Residential Amenity

5.45. The design of the Proposed Development ensures that there would be no significant adverse impact on the residential amenity of any existing property.

Impact on Local Services

5.46. Conditions, planning obligations and the required CIL payment would ensure that the impact of the Proposed Development on local services is appropriately mitigated.

Summary

5.47. In summary, other than a minor negative impact on landscape, the Proposed Development would deliver new residential development that would result in no other significant material harm to any environmental consideration, whilst delivering a wide range of positive environmental benefits that would outweigh the harm caused.

5.48. I thus consider that the environmental dimension of sustainable development is achieved and that moderate weight should be afforded to this.

Overall Summary

5.49. The Proposed Development clearly constitutes sustainable development, and there are no significant or demonstrable adverse impacts that would outweigh the benefits of granting planning permission and boosting the supply of housing.
6. Planning Policy Assessment

6.1. The determination of the application the subject of this Statement would be based on an assessment of two distinct areas of planning policy: the principle of development and the details of the Proposed Development.

Principle of Development

6.2. The primary requirement of the Framework is to secure sustainable development, and this material consideration must be taken into account when determining applications for planning permission. To do this, the Framework requires:

- Plans to be up-to-date and to meet the full objectively-assessed housing needs of an area;
- Plans and decisions to deliver the three aspects of sustainable development – economic, social and environmental; and
- Plans and decisions to take local circumstances into account so that appropriate responses are provided in differing locations.

6.3. Paragraph 14 of the Framework states that the presumption in favour of sustainable development is the ‘golden thread’ that runs through both plan-making and decision-taking.

6.4. For decision-taking it advises that this means “approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay”.

6.5. However, in cases such as this where “the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date”, the Framework sets out that planning permission should be granted for development proposals unless “any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole” or where specific policies (see footnote 9 to the Framework) indicate that development should be restricted. For the avoidance of any doubt, the Application Site is not subject to any of these restrictions or designations.

6.6. The provisions of paragraph 14 of the Framework are written into the DM DPD in Policy GC1 – Presumption in favour of sustainable development.

6.7. Policy GC1 thus extends some of the basic provisions of the NPPF into the Development Plan itself to the extent that the Development Plan now states that when considering development proposals – i.e. applications for planning permission, the Council would take an approach that reflects the presumption in favour of development.

6.8. In brief, this means that applications in accordance with policies in the Development Plan would be approved without delay, or where there are no policies relevant to the application or relevant policies are out of date, permission would be granted unless material considerations indicate otherwise – taking into account whether any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole; or specific policies in the NPPF indicate that development should be restricted.
6.9. By incorporating these basic provisions of the NPPF into the Development Plan, amended Policy GC1 establishes that, if (on balance) a proposal is sustainable development (in the terms of the NPPF), then it complies with GC1.

6.10. As discussed above, there are no adverse impacts that would result from granting planning permission for the Proposed Development that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the many benefits of granting permission and boosting the supply of housing. As such, the Proposed Development is sustainable development and hence in accordance with the requirements of Policy GC1.

6.11. The Framework states within the Core Planning principles (para 17) that every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing needs of an area and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth.

6.12. In Section 2 of this Statement, the shortfall in 5 year housing land supply is discussed, and as a consequence of Paragraph 49 of the Framework the Council’s policies relating to the supply of housing are out-of-date and less weight has to be afforded to them.

6.13. These policies include JCS Policy 4 ‘Housing Delivery’ which establishes the minimum housing requirement for Broadland within the NPA and Rural Area, and also DM DPD Policy GC2 which seeks to restrict the supply of housing within the settlement limits as defined on the Policies Map.

6.14. In assessing whether a site can assist in contributing towards the Council’s five year land supply the footnotes to paragraph 49 of the Framework provide additional guidance, adding that sites should:

- be available now;
- offer a suitable location for development now;
- be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing would be delivered on the site within five years;
- be viably developed at the point envisaged; and
- be in a suitable location for housing development.

6.15. This Proposed Development fully meets each of these criteria. The Application Site is available now and is under the control of the Applicant, a National Housebuilder, that can deliver the Site within 5 years following a grant of full planning permission. The Proposed Development is viable and in a suitable and sustainable location for development.

6.16. The provision of 259 additional dwellings would contribute towards meeting the District’s housing shortfall within the 5 year supply period. This is a material consideration in determining this application that should be afforded significant weight.
Development Management Matters

6.17. Policy GC4 – Design, sets out the expectations that new development should achieve a high standard of design. The reasoned justification to the policy provides details on how a development must pay adequate regard to character and appearance of the existing area, including the scale and landscaping through efficient use of land resources. The manner in which the requirements of this policy are addressed in the design of the Proposed Development are set out in the DAS submitted in support of the application.

6.18. Policy EN1 – Biodiversity and habitats, seeks to protect and enhance the biodiversity of the District, avoid the fragmentation of habitats and support the delivery of co-ordinated green infrastructure. The policy states that where harmful impacts might occur, it should be demonstrated that the development could not be located where it causes less harm, that adequate mitigation is proposed and that the benefits of the proposed development clearly outweigh the impacts.

6.19. In this case, the impacts on biodiversity as discussed earlier in this Statement would be negligible and in the longer term, even positive, hence the requirements of the policy are fulfilled.

6.20. Policy EN2 – Landscape, seeks to protect and enhance the various landscape character areas within the district through opportunities linked to development or other strategies. In addition the visually sensitive skylines, hillsides and valley sides and important views including the setting of the Broads Area are considered particularly significant.

6.21. In this case the, the impacts on landscape as discussed earlier in this Statement would, in the main, be limited to the impact on the Application Site itself and nearby views. In addition, the extensive proposed planting would, in the longer term, increase tree and vegetation cover. Hence the requirements of the policy are fulfilled.

6.22. Policy EN3 – Green infrastructure, states that all development should maximise opportunities to create well-managed wildlife habitat networks. It also sets out standards for the provision of informal open space and allotments, which are discussed in more detail below. Further, it notes the requirement that adequate arrangements be made for the management and maintenance of green infrastructure, which would in this case be addressed through conditions and / or planning obligations.

6.23. Policy EN4 – Pollution, sets out that there must be an assessment made of the extent of potential pollution whether existing or arising from the proposed development. This matter is fully addressed by the Phase 1 Contamination Assessment and Phase 2 Geoenvironmental Assessment reports submitted in support of the application.

6.24. Policy RL1 – Provision of formal recreational space, sets out standards for the provision of formal recreation and children’s play space, which are discussed in more detail below.
6.25. Policy TS2 – Travel Plans and Transport Assessments, requires the preparation of Transport Assessments and / or Travel Plans for major development proposals, whilst Policy TS3 – Highway safety, states that development would not be permitted where it would result in any significant adverse impact on the functioning of the highway or highway safety. Policy TS4 – Parking guidelines, states that appropriate parking and manoeuvring space must be provided in reflection of the use and location as well as accessibility for modes of transport other than car. All of these requirements are addressed in the Transport Assessment submitted in support of the application.

6.26. Policy CSU3 – Provision of community facilities or local services within large-scale residential development, requires ‘large-scale’ residential development proposals to include “appropriate provision for community facilities”. The DPD does not define ‘large-scale’. The reasoned justification explains that the facilities in question could comprise many different types of social, recreational and / or cultural facilities. In this case, Horsford has a wide range of services and facilities; rather than seeking to provide new additional facilities, the Proposed Development would reinforce the viability and vitality of the existing services and facilities.

6.27. Policy CSU4 – Provision of waste collection and recycling facilities within major development, states that major development proposals should include appropriate waste collection and recycling facilities. The DAS sets out the provisions included in the Proposed Development.

6.28. Policy CSU5 – Surface water drainage, sets out the expected mitigation measures which a development proposal must adhere to regarding surface water drainage including that the proposed developments must not increase the vulnerability of the site to flooding and should have a positive impact on the risk of surface water flooding in the wider area. All of these requirements are addressed in the Site-Specific Flood Risk Assessment submitted in support of the application.

Recreational Provision

6.29. The Council’s Recreational Provision in Residential Development SPD provides further, more in depth, guidance on Policies EN1, EN3 AND RL1 in the Development Management DPD. These policies expand on JCS Policy 1. The SPD confirms that strategic green infrastructure would be funded through CIL. It also sets out (para. 3.1) that there would be flexibility in the application of standards.

6.30. Policy EN3 sets out the requirement for informal recreational provision of at least 4 ha per 1,000 people (40 sqm per person). It also sets out the requirement for at least 0.16 ha of allotments per 1,000 people (1.6 sqm per person). However, the SPD explains that these are guideline figures and, at Table 3, provides the detailed requirements for different types of play space and sports provision based on dwelling size. The DAS sets out how these requirements are met.

6.31. Policy RL1 sets out the requirement for formal recreation provision of at least 0.34 ha of children’s play space per 1000 people (3.4 sqm per person). It also sets out the requirement for at least 1.68 ha of formal sports provision per 1,000 people (16.8 sqm per person). However, again, the SPD explains that these are guideline figures and, at Table 2, provides the detailed requirements for different types of play space and sports provision based on dwelling size. The DAS sets out how these requirements are met.
6.32. Whilst areas of informal recreation and children’s play space are proposed on-site, the SPD clarifies that for developments of less than 400 dwellings, it is acceptable for allotments and formal sports provisions to be provided off-site. In this case a contribution towards increased and improved provision off-site is proposed. Section 3 of the SPD contains figures to allow the amount of the off-site contribution to be calculated.
7. Conditions, Planning Obligations and CIL

**Planning Conditions**

7.1. Technical matters including highways, foul drainage, surface water drainage, archaeology, ecology are all considered to be capable of being controlled by appropriate planning conditions.

**Community Infrastructure Levy**

7.2. The Council operates a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charging regime.

7.3. The Council’s Regulation 123 List sets out the infrastructure which it intends could be funded, wholly, or partly by via CIL. The List includes: transportation, education, green infrastructure, sort and play provision and community infrastructure.

**Section 106 Obligations**

7.4. Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) sets out the principle that Section 106 planning obligations should only be sought by Local Planning Authorities where it would mitigate the impact of unacceptable development, in order to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

7.5. Draft Heads of Terms for a S106 Agreement are attached to this Statement at Appendix 2.
8. Summary and Conclusions

Summary

8.1. This Planning Statement has been prepared to support an application for full planning permission on land east of Holt Road, Horsford for the:

“Erection of 259 dwellings, together with associated public open space, landscaping, highways and drainage infrastructure works.”

8.2. The Application Site comprises approximately 11.27 ha, mostly of relatively flat and level agricultural land situated to the north of Horsford, to the east of Holt Road, together with no. 360 Holt Road (also known as ‘Flagcutters’) and its curtilage.

8.3. Planning permission is sought for the Proposed Development to address a shortfall in local housing supply on a sustainable site in a sustainable location. The JCS identifies Horsford as a ‘Service Village’ within the NPA, with a good range of facilities that is considered capable of supporting additional residential development.

8.4. At present, the Council is only able to demonstrate a supply of 4.91 years’ worth of housing land and is thus unable to demonstrate the 5 year supply required by the NPPF; thus the provisions of paragraphs 14 and 49 of the Framework are engaged and policies relating to the supply of housing – for example settlement boundaries, should be considered out-of-date; thus less weight can be given to them in the consideration of a planning application.

8.5. In such circumstances the Framework requires that planning permission 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”.

8.6. The Proposed Development clearly constitutes sustainable development, and there are no significant or demonstrable adverse impacts that would outweigh the benefits of granting planning permission and boosting the supply of housing.

8.7. Policy GC1 incorporates some of the basic provisions of the NPPF into the Development Plan such that, in determining whether the Proposed Development is in accordance with the Development Plan as a whole, an assessment must be undertaken as to whether the Proposed Development represents sustainable development: if it does, then Policy GC1 establishes a presumption in favour of the Proposed Development that must be weighed into the balance in determining whether it is in accordance with the Development Plan, rather than whether the fact that it is sustainable development is a material consideration that has to be weighed against a failure to be in accordance with the Development Plan.

8.8. As the Proposed Development is sustainable development, the Development Plan provides that the presumption in favour should be applied in the determination as to whether it is in accordance with the Development Plan as a whole.
Conclusions

8.9. The Proposed Development is sustainable development and the presumption in favour should apply.

8.10. The numerous and significant benefits that would be delivered as a result clearly and easily outweigh the few adverse impacts.

8.11. There are no specific policies in the NPPF that indicate that development should be restricted, nor are there any adverse impacts that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework when taken as a whole.

8.12. In accordance with Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, on balance, the Proposed Development is in accordance with the Development Plan, and planning permission should be granted.
Appendices
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EIA Screening Opinion
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Application Number
20161418

Savills
FAO: Ms Lydia Voyias
Unex House
132-134 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB2 8PA

Date Of Decision : 01 September 2016
Development : Erection of 259 Dwellings - Screening Opinion
Location : Land to the East of Holt Road, Horsford
Applicant : David Wilson Homes
Application Type : EIA Screening Opinion


The proposed development falls within the description at paragraph 10 (b) ‘Urban Development Projects’ of Schedule 2 of the above Regulations on the basis that the area of development exceeds the thresholds specified in column 2 (as amended); 150 dwellings and 5 hectares.

Having taken into account the criteria set out in Schedule 3 of the Regulations the Local Planning Authority is of the opinion that the development would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment by virtue of factors such as its characteristics, location, size, potential impact or cumulation with other development. Further details of the Screening Opinion are below.

Accordingly, the Local Planning Authority has adopted the opinion that the development referred to above is not EIA development as defined in the Regulations.

The reasons for the decision are:-

The proposed development is for up to 259 dwellings and open space and the site area is approximately 11.16 hectares. It is adjacent to a residential development for 125 dwellings which was granted planning permission under reference 20130547.

Guidance on identification of Schedule 2 development requiring Environmental Impact Assessment suggests that the likelihood of significant effects will generally depend upon the characteristics of the development (e.g. size, use of natural resources, quantities of pollution and waste generated), the environmental sensitivity of the location, and the characteristics of the potential impact (e.g. its magnitude and duration). The possible cumulative effects should also be considered.

The Local Planning Authority is of the opinion that it is unlikely the proposed development in isolation or in combination would result in significant effects on the environment. The proposed development is not of more than local importance in terms of its environmental and ecological effects that cannot be assessed and addressed within the normal
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20161418</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

validation requirements and determination of the planning application.

It is therefore considered unlikely that the development would result in significant environmental effects within the meaning of the EIA Regulations.

Signed

Mr P Courtier
Head of Planning
Broadland District Council, Thorpe Lodge, 1 Yarmouth Road, Thorpe St Andrew, Norwich, NR7 0DU
Appendix 2
Draft Heads of Terms for a S106 Agreement
1.0 Proposed Head of Terms

1.1 The Heads of Terms are subject to Committee resolution to grant planning permission and the completion of a Section 106 Agreement. In such circumstances, BDW Eastern Counties will enter into the obligations to secure:

1. Broadland District Council operates a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) which seeks funds towards infrastructure as specified within the Councils Regulation 123 list. The site is located within CIL Zone A. The CIL rate for applications granted planning permission in 2016 is £91.74 per m2 of residential development excluding affordable housing.

2. In addition to CIL payment it is anticipated that a legal agreement will be required to secure planning obligations related to the development, the detail of which is to be agreed with Officers during the application process and in accordance with the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations and Core Strategy Policy 20 ‘Implementation’

3. Affordable housing provision comprising:
   a. up to 33% of the total number of residential dwelling to be affordable
      60% affordable rent
      40% discounted market units (80% OMV)

4. Open Space Provision and Maintenance