

## DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

11 December 2018

### Additional Information Report

PJ2 – S18/1752

**Proposal:** Erection of a 4-bedroom dwelling and garage

**Site Address:** 23 Main Road, Dyke, PE10 0AF

### **Summary of Information Received:**

The agent for the application has submitted the following additional information:

- Drawing No. 183208 received 6 December 2018 showing driveway to be 4.1m
- Additional statement received 7 December 2018 showing agent's interpretation of the 'village envelope' and justification for the site being considered as 'brownfield'
- Drawing SSP01 received 7 December 2018 with annotations in relation to above
- Drawing SSP02 received 7 December 2018 showing street scene of Main Road pre and post development S10/0357

### **Officer comments:**

#### Site access

The agent has submitted a plan showing the driveway to be 4.1m in width as requested by the Highway Authority. Although this has not been measured on-site to verify if this is achievable as the drive passes 23 Main Road, this would alleviate any concerns raised in relation to access.

Regardless of whether the width of the drive at the narrowest point is 3m as previously specified or 4.1m as now proposed, this would not be considered as a reason to refuse planning permission. The access is an existing access to 23 Main Road and its continued use for an additional dwelling would be unlikely to result in any unacceptable highway impacts. Building Regulations require an access width of 3.7m for a fire tender vehicle to access a site, however, if this cannot be provided a condition requiring the installation of a sprinkler system would be an appropriate alternative solution.

#### Information relating to nature of land previous residential development in Dyke

The National Planning Policy Framework definition of 'brownfield' or previously developed land is as follows:

**“Previously developed land:** Land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed) and any associated fixed surface infrastructure. This excludes: land that is or was last occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings; land that has been developed for minerals extraction or waste disposal by landfill, where provision for restoration has been made through development management procedures; land in built-up areas such as residential gardens, parks, recreation grounds and allotments; and land that

was previously developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structure have blended into the landscape.”

It is accepted that there are various remaining outbuildings within the curtilage of 23 Main Road. The agent has submitted a statement that suggests these buildings were previously used for non-domestic purposes as part of an agricultural repairs business. There is no planning history to support this previous use of the site, however, the Local Planning Authority also has no information to dispute this. The land forming the planning application site is considered to be previously developed land that was used in association with the agricultural repairs business.

The agent has submitted additional information regarding their interpretation of the extent of the village. Land to the north and west is a caravan site used in connection with the neighbouring public house, however, there are no permanent structures within the site. Land to the east is domestic garden land. Further, the dwelling as proposed would extend a significant distance further to the north than development permitted by S10/0357 which relates to another site in the village and comprises the redevelopment of Holme Farm.

The NPPF at paragraph 78, encourages housing in rural areas where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.

This application is finely balanced, but taking account of all the various issues in the round; the benefit of one additional dwelling would not outweigh the harmful impact of allowing new development in a smaller village where development is not allowed under Core Strategy Policies SP1 and H1 together with its impact on the character and historic pattern of development in the village.

### **Recommendation:**

For clarity the reasons for refusal have been updated as follows:

1. The proposed development by virtue of its scale, appearance and siting, would result in the unacceptable introduction of built form to the north of the existing linear pattern of development along Main Road which is contrary to the established spatial characteristics of the area. In consequence the development, would result in harm to the character and historic pattern of development in the area which is contrary to Core Strategy Policy EN1 and the NPPF Section 12.
2. The proposal does not fall under any of the categories of development described in Core Strategy Policy SP1 that would be considered acceptable in a location such as Dyke. The proposal would therefore result in unjustified additional residential development in a village which is not considered suitable for new dwellings. As such the proposals are considered contrary to the requirements of Core Strategy Policies SP1 and H1 and the principles of sustainable development as advocated by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).