

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

7 November 2012

AUTHOR/S: Planning and New Communities Director

S0702/12/FL - LITLINGTON

**Demolition of Existing Public House. Redevelopment of site and erection of a 70 Bedroom hotel with associated parking for cars, coaches and delivery area. Ancillary food and drink facilities and conference rooms and works to vehicle access and egress and landscaping for Findlay Duthie Partnership
Recommendation: Refusal**

Date for Determination: 3 July 2012

This application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination as the Litlington Parish Council recommendation differs from the officer recommendation.

Members will visit the site on 6 November 2012

To be presented to the Committee by Saffron Garner

Site and Proposal

1. The 0.899 hectare site is located on the A505 road between Royston and Baldock, in the parishes of Litlington and Steeple Morden. It is a well-used route that provides a link between Cambridge and London, which is located approximately 35 miles to the south. It is located approximately 3 miles from Royston and 12 miles from Cambridge to the northeast. The site is situated outside of the designated village frameworks, and is currently laid predominately to concrete hard standing, with an unused public house that has fallen in to disrepair. There is a single point of access to the west of the existing public house building. This has been blocked off for sometime to prevent use of the land unlawfully.
2. The application submitted February 2012 seeks planning permission for the demolition of the existing building and the redevelopment of the site to form a 70 bedroom budget hotel (46 rooms at ground floor and 24 at first floor) with 76 parking spaces and coach parking plus delivery area, ancillary food and drink facilities and conference rooms. The works include improvements to the vehicular access and egress arrangements to the site and landscaping. The gross internal floor area of the proposal equates to 2724m² (29, 231 sqft). The application was submitted with the following documents
 - Planning Statement
 - Design and Access Statement
 - Heritage Statement
 - Health Impact Assessment
 - Market Need, Sequential Test and Impact Assessment
 - Transport Assessment and Travel Plan plus drawing
 - Ventilation Strategy

- Renewable Energy Report
- External Lighting Statement
- Foul Water Assessment
- Utility Services Report
- Phase 1 Preliminary Contamination Assessment
- Ecology Survey
- Landscape and Visual Assessment

Planning History

3. S/1310/12/F sought the renewal of the consent granted under reference S/0509/09/F - Approved
4. S/0509/09/F proposed the erection of a restaurant building with ancillary accommodation following the demolition of the existing building. This application was 100% bigger than the existing building and it was decided at Planning Committee that this would be the largest extension we could sustainably allow on the redevelopment of this site. It was approved subject to the conditions.
5. S/2115/06/F proposed the erection of a 30 bedroom hotel following the demolition of the existing public house premises. This application was refused and later withdrawn by the applicants at Appeal stage.
6. S/1922/06/F proposed the erection of a 26 bedroom hotel demolition of the existing public house premises. The application was refused.

Planning Policy

7. **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)** the thrust of this document suggests a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. Local Planning Authorities are directed to plan positively for new development and approve development proposals that accord with the development plan (paragraph 14).
8. Paragraph 24 states that sequential testing should apply to planning applications for main town centre uses that are not in an existing centre and are not in accordance with an up to date Local Plan. In considering edge of centre and out of centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites that are well connected to the town centre with flexibility on issues such as format and scale are relevant considerations.

South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2007

9. **ST/7 Infill Villages**
10. **South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies 2007**

DP/1 Sustainable Development
DP/2 Design of New Development
DP/3 Development Criteria
DP/7 Development Frameworks

CH/2 Archaeological Sites
CH/8 Advertisements
ET/8 Replacement Buildings in the Countryside
ET/10 Tourist Facilities and Visitor Accommodation
NE/1 Energy Efficiency
NE/2 Renewable Energy
NE/3 Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development
NE/4 Landscape Character Areas
NE/6 Biodiversity
NE/14 Lighting Proposals
TR/2 Car and Cycle Parking Standards
TR/3 Mitigating Travel Impact

11. District Design Guide SPD (adopted March 2010)
Health Impact Assessment SPD (2011)
12. Circular 11/95 (The use of Conditions in Planning Permissions) advises that planning conditions should be necessary, relevant to planning, relevant to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects.

Consultations

13. **Litlington Parish Council** recommends Approval.
14. **Steeple Morden Parish Council** recommend Approval subject to the following
 - S106 funds should be for work in the village with a requirement for a contribution to junction improvements at the Osdey/A505 junction due to the additional traffic. The application recognises the problems at this junction and at that leading to Litlington
 - A full environmental survey should be carried out
 - Car parking spaces should be limited to 76, with the premises used only as a hotel and conference centre now and in the future.
15. **North Hertfordshire District Council** recommend refusal for the scheme and have provided a comprehensive response which is on file. The conclusion states: It is noted that there are substantial areas of the site to the east and south that are currently green and not covered in buildings or hard standing, which would largely be built on as part of the proposal. As such there are concerns that this proposal would involve a significant encroachment of development into the countryside.

The NPPF defines, for practical purposes, sustainable development (in England) as having 3 interrelated dimensions – all of which must be addressed. The proposal would need to serve the economic, social and environmental roles as set out in the NPPF. Given the potential impact on Royston Town Centre, my Council would be concerned that the proposal may not accord with the requirements of the ‘economic’ and ‘social’ roles. At the macro level the proposed scheme may serve an ‘economic’ role, as it would provide overnight accommodation at perhaps a regional level. However, at the micro level the proposed scheme may not meet the requirements of the ‘economic’ role, as it may have a potentially damaging effect on the viability

and vitality of Royston. The proposal may not accord with the requirements of the 'social' role for the same reasons. Given the potential impact of the development on the SSSI and character of the landscape my Council remains unconvinced that the proposal would comply with the requirements of the 'environmental' role. Given the concerns raised above with regard to the impact of the design of the proposed development on the setting of the SSSI and the character of the landscape, it could be questioned whether the proposal would *"take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions"*, as set out in paragraph 64 of the NPPF.

16. In brief the concerns raised are as follows:
 - Contrary to paragraph 17 and 55 of the NPPF,
 - Disproportionate
 - Sequential testing seems sound but the size of the scheme is questioned
 - potentially damaging to the town centre given the economic climate
 - very visible from Thurfield Heath
 - Impact on Character Area 227
 - Excessive bulk
 - Impact on the SSSI
17. The Royston Town Manager on behalf of Royston Town Council states that the business community in general would welcome this development. Although Royston can offer boutique hotels and guest houses, there is a perceived lack of 'branded' hotel accommodation. Companies looking for such outlets are generally forced to send their visitors in the direction of Cambridge. The fact that the plans include conference facilities is also welcome. It is hoped that the latest offerings in the world of conferencing will become available to Royston businesses at a realistic price. I can confirm at this time that nothing in the proposed development conflicts with larger scale conferencing facilities proposed in conjunction with the cinema development currently underway in the town.
18. The **Environmental Health Officer (Contaminated Land)** is satisfied with the information submitted and raises no objection
19. The **Environmental Health Officer (Noise/Pollution)** has commented extensively on the impact of noise, vibration, hours of demolition and construction, insulation, attenuation, lighting, odour and regulation and licensing of the site.
20. It has recommended an array of appropriately worded conditions if the application is approved with regard to the above. Full comments are on file.
21. The **Landscape Officer** has made the following comments:
 - The building and the associated car parking areas are large, and take up virtually the whole site, greatly increasing the development footprint. It will be difficult for any landscape scheme to fully mitigate against impact on the wider landscape, particularly if space available on site for landscape is limited and it is a requirement that the road frontage remains relatively open.

- However, if the building were to take the proposed form and layout form the following should be considered:
 - We would want to be satisfied (via the EA) that they are happy with the proposed foul drainage system (discharging under the car park into the chalk aquifer?) and how this will work with the car park drainage (silt, oil etc.) which does not appear in the volume calculations or on the drawings
 - The infiltration field shown on drawing 715749/ME/SK01 P2 is less than 5m from building and bedrooms and the EA have indicated a minimum of 10m.
 - Drainage details will be needed for the general landscaped areas and pond/swale areas.
 - The frontage landscape is an improvement but is still very tight in the centre of the site. Given the one way direction of traffic (everything from the west) is the whole of the clear verge and acceleration lane (7m deep) needed?
 - Some landscape and /or screening will be needed around the patio/overspill seating areas if these are to be useable spaces. Access will only be needed in the areas where the bus's doors will be positioned
 - The entrance canopy will appear weak and 'added on' compared to the rest of the building. The cycle storage area may be better as a continuation of the covered frontage, creating a stronger entrance space.
 - The last one or two car parking bays to the east of the substation may have to be relocated, or 'no dig' construction used to avoid damage to the mature Beech tree to the north.
 - Planting details will be needed (species, numbers, sizes etc.) including specialist plants for the green roof, wet areas etc.
22. The **Urban Design Officer** has updated comments following on going negotiation. Although the scheme has benefitted from officer input the design of the scheme is still not supported by officers. Members will be updated accordingly.
23. **Cambridge Fire and Rescue Service** have asked that there is adequate provision for fire hydrants which should be secured by way of a S106.
24. The **S106 Officer** has made the following comments:

In the planning statement the applicant recognises the planning policy SF/6 public art, however has not submitted a public art plan with the application. It is therefore not known whether the applicant is proposing to provide public art as part of the proposal.

In January 2009 South Cambridgeshire District Council adopted the public art supplementary planning document that expands on development control policy SF/6. The policy states the District Council will encourage the provision or commissioning of publicly accessible art, craft and design works on

residential developments comprising 10 or more dwellings other developments where the floor area to be built is 1,000 m² gross or more, including office, manufacturing, warehousing and retail developments.

Where a development has not included provision for public art within the scheme the District Council will negotiate with the applicant to provide a financial contribution in lieu of this policy in order to fund the provision of a public art scheme elsewhere in the Parish. The policy incorporates a 'percentage for art' formula in order to calculate the level of public art works/contribution with between 1-5% of the total construction cost being required as the public art works/contributions.

In recent years the District Council has secured public art works for several hotel schemes. The precedent set by these negotiations suggest that the value of public art works for this application should be in the region of £30,000 however, this is only an indicative figure for a basis of further negotiation. The Council is more concerned about the quality of public art rather than its cost.

Any public art provision would need to be secured through a section 106 agreement, with a public art plan to be submitted to the Council for approval prior to the commencement of development.

25. The **Ecology Officer** raises no objection with regard to ecology on the application site or with regard to the ecology on the neighbouring SSSI.
26. The **Building Control Officer** raises no objections
27. The **Local Highway Authority (Hertfordshire County Council)** confirms that visibility is acceptable subject to further technical drawings being submitted and associated S278 road works. It confirms that the transport assessment submitted is sound. No historical accident problems are known from this site and the trip generation information sufficient not to cause concern. Whilst it is appreciated that the hotel will have the majority of trips made by private car the uplift would result in a proposed 1.4% increase in eastbound traffic on a weekday. This is considered to be insignificant in comparison to the existing flows along the A505. Hertfordshire County Council as highway authority has considered that the proposal would not have an unreasonable impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining highways with the inclusion of the recommended planning conditions and highway informatives provided.

Representations

28. There have been three letters of objection regarding the development of this site. These concerns are raised by local residents, business owners and CPRE Hertfordshire. They are as follows:
 - Overdevelopment and out of proportion
 - Isolated position and impact on sustainability
 - visually detrimental
 - Impact on important local and historic landscape
 - Footprint of proposed scheme is considerably larger than the property it intends to replace
 - should be located in a town centre location
 - No demand in this location for a budget hotel
 - An independent feasibility study should be carried out by the applicants

29. 9 letters of support have also been received, including support from the Local MP.

Material Planning Considerations

30. The main issues in this case are:
- Principle of Development
 - Sustainability
 - Impact on the character of the area and surrounding landscape
 - Impact on neighbour amenity
 - Highway Safety
 - Other Matters

Introduction

31. The details of the submitted reports indicate that the application has undergone various feasibility studies to suggest that the proposed scheme is the only viable option for the redevelopment of the site. It also suggests that the requirement to build this type of development has emerged through extensive research by major national hotel consultancies GVA Humberts Leisure, which have concluded that there is a demand for a budget hotel in this location. It also reports that the size of the hotel would satisfy the identified short to medium term need. It is considered that the hotel of the hotel proposed is likely to offer the most favourable business model to ensure overall viability.
32. The responses from those consulted has demonstrated that the site is in need of redevelopment and that the facility is more likely to provide a positive impact on surrounding businesses than not. Royston Town Council has recommended the scheme for approval and considers this development as an opportunity to promote Royston as a tourist destination. There is some concern that the new development will harm the viability of Royston Town Centre, however a sequential test has been applied to a series of sites around Royston and the outcome is that this is the only site suitable in market and viability terms for a development of this kind.
33. Based on the information made available as part of the submissions Officers are content that the right level of assessment has been carried out prior to the submission of the scheme to address sequential site testing in line with policy requirements.

Principle of Development

34. Notwithstanding the above information the principle of development has been established based on the history of the site. It is clear through this history that the scheme approved under reference S2115/06/F was considered to be the highest acceptable limit of development permitted on this site. The approved scheme suggested that a 100% increase in footprint and volume was acceptable and no higher. This scheme proposes a floor area that is nearly 5.5 times bigger than that of the approved scheme and nearly 11 times bigger than that of the original building. The scheme is contrary to the requirements of Policy ET/8 and this scale of development cannot be supported for this reason in the first instance. The scheme is also contrary to the requirements of Policy ET/10 that relates to tourist facilities and visitor accommodation and specifically relates to development outside of frameworks within the countryside. This policy states that outside development frameworks,

development to provide overnight visitor accommodation and restaurants will only be permitted by change of use / conversion, or through appropriate replacement of buildings not requiring large extension, or by appropriately modest extensions to existing facilities. The application site is not within a designated development framework and considered to be very remote to those of the surrounding villages. It is considered to be unsustainable in terms of its location and sensitive with regard to the visual impact to the character and openness of the countryside. As a consequence, the proposal is considered to be contrary to the requirements of Policy ET/10 and therefore the principle of tourist accommodation on this scale within this location is unacceptable.

Sustainability

35. In addition to the above the location of the site has always been of considerable concern. The site is remote and only accessible by motor vehicle. Whilst it has been demonstrated that a Green Travel Plan can be put in place for those employed on site it is still considered to promote a significant level of private vehicle movement to and from the site at an unacceptable level. Whilst Herts County Council have not raised objections to the increase in traffic from a safety viewpoint and the 1.4% increase of traffic is considered low in comparison to the existing movement on the A505, the hotel business requires the free flow of visitors to enable full success. It is not in easy reach of local train stations and the scale of the proposal suggests large amounts of visitors on a regular basis. It is not a site that lends itself to access by bus, cycle or on foot. For this reason the scheme is considered to be unsustainable and therefore contrary to the principle requirements of Policy DP/1 of the Local Development Framework Adopted 2007.

Impact on the character of the area

36. Prior to submission the application was the subject of various pre-application meetings. Whilst it was made clear at the onset that the scheme may fail on policy principles the applicant and agents were still keen to ensure that the design of the scheme had significant input from officers to enable the highest quality design approach possible.
37. The principle of the design has been focussed around the surrounding landscape character and the architect has tried to incorporate this into the design of the building. The main part of the building located at the front of the site, near to the existing entrance has been designed to be the focal part of the development. It is located in such a way so as to avoid the need for numerous signs along the A505 indicating its location. The building is designed to be prominent but the right use of materials and orientation is also aimed at fitting with its surroundings.
38. The rest of the hotel is located to the rear and west of the application site. The design forms a 'y' shape and the upper part of the 'y' is where the rooms will be located. The structure of the building that houses the rooms is taken from the principle design of agricultural buildings. The roof slope starts at single storey, sloping up and away from the surrounding countryside to allow for a first floor. The external appearance of the roof slope is proposed as green roof giving the appearance of the surrounding hills to the south at Therfield Heath. A small courtyard area is proposed inside the upper 'y' area. It is intended that the first floor of rooms will be limited from external views of

the site. The car parking is located to the west of the rooms comprising 76 parking spaces with associated landscaping.

39. The design of the building has taken on board some of the agreed principles discussed at the early design stages, however the overall concern comes from the pure scale of the development and the impact the building and associated parking will have on the wider landscape. It is appreciated that the applicants have wanted to try and achieve a design that best fits with the surrounding landscape. If it was to be approved it is considered an absolute necessity that this expanse of roof is secured as green roof to ensure its compatibility with its immediate surroundings. There are a mixture of external materials proposed that are aimed at complementing the form and shape of the proposed structure in relation to the landscape. These would need further consideration however; the applicant is open to suggestion and negotiation where necessary.
40. In comparison to the existing building and the already approved scheme the built form is considerably larger in scale and it is this mass of built form that is considered to be contrary to the requirements of policy. Even with the best attempts to mitigate the scheme, the presence of the building in the landscape is considered to cause significant harm to the wider landscape.

Impact on neighbour amenity

41. The impact on neighbour amenity is considered to have been appropriately addressed by way of on going discussion with the applicants and those in close proximity to the site. Various measures have been proposed to help mitigate any potential harm, as already listed in the Environmental Health officer comments. Providing these are put in place it is not considered that neighbour impact would be adversely impacted. Concerns raised by those close by include mitigation of noise and disturbance from the building and associated car park.

Impact on Highway Safety

42. The Local Highway Authority, Hertfordshire District Council comments are noted. The LHA have not raised any concerns with regard to the application as various pre-application discussions took place to ensure all matters were adequately addressed prior to submission. The access to the site would, as part of the application, improve the existing access. It is unlikely as part of the scheme, if approved, that the applicant would make contributions to other parts of the A505 as requested by Steeple Morden Parish Council. This has been requested before in other applications represented at committee and has failed. The LHA has requested that appropriately worded conditions are put in place should the application be considered for approval.
43. With regard to parking facilities the application proposes 76 spaces for the uses of the hotel. This includes all parking facilities, staff, visitor and disabled provision. This is short of approximately 13 spaces if using the maximum standards (13 spaces per 10 guest rooms). This standard is from the Local Development Framework Policies adopted 2007 and is a maximum figure. Although the figure is marginally short of this it is not unacceptable or encourages a reason for refusal.

Other Matters

44. The S106 Officer has raised the query regarding Public Art and whilst it is a requirement for schemes over certain floor area thresholds, the discussions that have taken place regarding this site at pre-application stage and under earlier applications over the last 6 years, officers have not required provision of public art on this site. It would be more than acceptable for the client to incorporate local art as part of the décor and we would encourage this in and outside the building, however, it has not been a requirement of this particular scheme and officers have not suggested it would be refused if no provision is made.

Conclusion

45. The application site is in need of redevelopment and officers have seen various schemes submitted over the years for this site that have been consistently unacceptable. This is primarily down the lack of an evidence base, other more suitable sites being readily available and not having carried out sufficient sequential site testing. This is amongst other issues such as design, sustainability and impact on the wider countryside. The applications that have come forward thus far have had problems with all of the above either individually or combined and this application is no different, regardless as to how much officers would like to see this site redeveloped and put to good use.
46. Officers are content that the information submitted regarding site assessment is now sound. There has been question about its viability and whether the scheme proposed would actually result in success. However, this is not a question that can be answered by officers. A business model has been put together and success on this site is not something anyone can safely predict in the current climate. The evidence base for the sequential testing has been put forward and the assessment shows a degree of negative impact on the existing town centre facilities in the first couple of years of development. This is likely to be underestimated and although forecasting any type of retail/leisure growth is likely to contain uncertainties, the existing hotel offer in the local area relatively small, therefore the development may swamp the market. Based on the existing economic climate and the current state of Royston Town Centre this may have a potentially damaging effect on its viability and vitality. However, the comments from Royston Town Council are noted and no objections are raised with regard to this proposal.
47. On the plus side this type of facility could provide a positive impact on the surrounding businesses and the town in general, encouraging economic growth in addition to jobs created by the development itself. However this must be weighted against the potential for negative impact on the town centre and the other concerns that this development has raised. Notwithstanding, there has been a lot of support for the scheme from local residents and businesses. The design is considered to have been well thought through as far as practicably reasonable for a building of this size and the improvements to the access are a result of the development scale.
48. The development has aimed to address all areas of concern in the newly adopted NPPF and whilst there are many areas that officers consider acceptable, on balance there are many that are not. The NPPF suggests that

the roles in achieving sustainable development should not be undertaken in isolation because they are mutually dependent. Economic growth can secure higher social and environmental standards and well designed buildings can improve lives and therefore the roles in achieving sustainability should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system.

49. In terms of the economic role support has been given with regard to creating more jobs, however this is considered on balance with the potential that the development may harm the vitality and viability of more centrally located businesses. It has been demonstrated by the applicants that there is a need for this type of hotel in this area and consent was granted for a smaller budget hotel at the Little Chef site some years ago (this consent is no longer extant).
50. As part of the social role if economic development is harmed it will have a knock on affect socially. The site is not located close to any local communities and therefore its immediate impact will be limited, such as neighbour amenity. However, the proposal will introduce new employment roles as well as increasing visitor opportunities to the District. On balance this has to be assessed with the location of the site and the level of vehicular movement a development of this scale would introduce. This must consider not only visitors, but also those working on and delivering to the site on a daily basis.
51. An Environmental role is probably the area where this application is considered to primarily fail. Whilst every effort has been taken to ensure the design works in tune with the natural landscape, location and the site constraints the scale, design and form of the development is still considered to harm the wider landscape and more specifically the views from and surrounding Thurfield Heath in this particularly open area of countryside. The submissions have detailed why various renewable energy sources have been disregarded; however the design has also tried to take on board the local landscape by including a green roof proposal. In this scheme the application of PV cells have been applied to the south facing roof slope to comply with our current policies, however officers do not consider this, together with some of the other benefits of the scheme are enough to tip the balance in allowing this scheme to be bought forward.
52. The building has a significant footprint and the proposed area of the new building is far higher than the already approved 100% increase that was allowed under the last consent granted. The number of rooms is far higher than ever proposed on this site, and whilst its size is considered necessary for reasons of viability, this scale of development is considered significantly inappropriate. The high number of vehicles visiting the site as a result of the proposed development is also considered to be excessive and highly unsustainable.
53. It is for the fo.lloing reasons that officers recommend the application is refused:

Recommendation

54. Refuse for the following reasons:
 1. The scheme proposes redevelopment of the entire site and the floor area is proposed to be nearly 11 times bigger than that originally

approved under S/0509/09/F. This is therefore contrary to the requirements of Policy ET/8 of the Local Development Control Policies adopted 2007 that specifically considers replacement buildings in the countryside for employment use. The policy states that any increase in floor area will be strictly controlled, and must be for the benefit of the design, or in order to better integrate the development with its surroundings. In this instance the increase in floor area is excessive, the building is not suitably located and the size and scale would not result in an environmental improvement that would result in more sustainable development.

2. The redevelopment of the site is also considered to be contrary to the requirement of Policy ET/10 of the of the Local Development Control Policies adopted 2007 which states that development to provide overnight visitor accommodation, public houses, and restaurants will only be permitted by change of use/conversion, or through appropriate replacement of buildings not requiring large extensions, or by appropriately modest extensions to existing facilities. Notwithstanding the submissions that have demonstrated a need for additional rooms in the area focus for new accommodation should be in villages and development of a type in keeping with settlement size, scale and form. The aim of the policy focusses on new tourist accommodation being located in the larger villages allowing access to visitors to the the public transport network and local services thus promoting the goals of sustainable development.
3. The application is not sustainable as it fails to minimise the need to travel by private car - walking and cycling to the site are unrealistic options. As such it is contrary to the Policy DP/1 and TR/1 of the Local Development Framework Policies adopted 2007 that aims to permit development where it is demonstrated that it is consistent with the principles of sustainable development as appropriate to its location, scale and form and will only allow development that does not give rise to a material increase in travel demands unless the site has (or will attain) a sufficient standard of accessibility to offer an appropriate choice of travel by public transport or other non-car travel modes.
4. The application was submitted with a Landscape and Visual Assessment dated September 2012 and it recognises that the neighbouring SSSI Therfeild Heath has a very high landscape quality that is highly valued with extensive public access over the semi natural chalk grassland and expansive views over the arable land to the north. It is considered to have a very high sensitivity to development that is already affected by the A505 and industrial and commercial development to the north east. It also states that the site as derelict will be improved by redevelopment of this type. However, it is considered that due to its location, size and scale, the development will have a significantly adverse impact on the surrounding landscape. The proposed landscaping is considered to be weak in places with little scope to help further mitigate the impact of the proposed development. It is therefore considered to be contrary to the requirements of Policy DP/3 that states planning permission will not be granted where the proposed development would have an

unacceptable adverse impact on the countryside and landscape character.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report

- National Planning Policy Framework
- Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPDs
- National Planning Policy Framework
- Planning file reference S/0702/12/FL, S/0509/09/F and S/1922/07/F

Contact Officer: Saffron Garner – Senior Planning Officer
01954 713256