

PLANNING COMMITTEE DATE: 19th October 2022

APPLICATION NO: F/YR21/1072/FDL

SITE LOCATION: Land East of Bevills Close and North of Eastmoor Lane, Doddington

UPDATE

Six further representations have been received. Five are from residents and the other is from Parish Cllr Ruth Hopkins who is the Chair of Doddington Neighbourhood Plans Group.

Residents' comments:

Reiteration and summary of the comments already made and additionally;

- The Highway Authority has stated that maximum number of dwellings using one access/exit junction is 100.

Officer comment: The LHA would wish to see a further access given the in excess of 100 properties served off Bevills Close etc plus the development. The LHA suggested that an emergency access may resolve this matter and have accepted the proposed emergency access via 44 Bevills Close. The LHA stated several months ago that there is not an issue with local roads not having capacity to take additional traffic from 47 new houses.

- Developers are making all sorts of promises regarding the building process. Is anyone going to check on them to make sure they stick to their word. Of course not and they know it.

Officer comment: There are limitations as to what planning can achieve during the building process as the main policy concerns are connected to the development itself. However, a Construction Management Plan condition is proposed, and this is required to be submitted for approval. If the agreements in the CMP are breached, then they would be investigated.

- Another neighbour raises similar comments regarding the access and number of vehicles served and also that the development will create a precedent.

Officer comment: The decision taken on this proposal will not create a precedent whether that decision is to approve or refuse the application. Other sites in Doddington are different and will be considered on their own merits.

Cllr Hopkins raises the following comments which are summarised;

The Neighbourhood Planning Group does not agree that that the scale and location of development is appropriate for the village and that it will impact upon the core shape and character of the village contrary to policy LP12.

Regarding policy LP13, there is insufficient infrastructure to support the village. We welcome the additional land for the school, but this does nothing to address the shortage of spaces at the school. Through discussions over the Neighbourhood Plan the Group is aware through the Education Authority that the school is oversubscribed and yet neither comments from the Education Authority nor the

officer report express this position. The additional play space will be useful to the school, but the school needs to expand with larger classrooms. Providing play space is not therefore a tangible benefit to the school or local community.

The group is very disappointed that the level of infrastructure negotiated is only the school land i.e. no affordable housing or other contributions and taking this into account the development is clearly contrary to policies LP12 and LP13.

It seems perverse that the site has been excluded from those in Doddington being taken forward in the current draft Local Plan consultation – specifically the Sites for Evidence Report (part D) pages 78-79. The site was rejected as other more suitable sites have been selected in Doddington.

The Council does have a 5-year land supply so there is no need to approve.

The Doddington Neighbourhood Group strongly objects to this planning application for these reasons.

Officer comment:

Officers disagree that the proposal is of a scale and in a location that is not appropriate for the village as set out in the main report. The site is well related to the village and surrounded on 2.5 sides by other development. The scale of development is not such that it must be directed to one of the market towns.

It is understood that there is a shortage of spaces at the school. This is true for any development being proposed in Doddington. The Education Authority and the school have accepted that the transfer of land is acceptable. During verbal discussions on site with the education authority and the school, the additional land was seen as providing better potential for the school to expand into its current site in the future although that would be subject to separate consideration from this proposal. At present the school has insufficient land to expand. The submitted viability report has been assessed by the Planning Obligations Officer who has found it to be robust i.e. the development cannot afford contributions other than those proposed.

The Council does have a 5-year housing land supply but that is not reason to refuse an application that is considered to meet the development plan policy. The main report sets out that the proposal has been considered in this context i.e. the tilted balance does not apply.

The proposed development cannot be said to be premature to the emerging local plan because that plan is not at an advanced enough stage. Looking at the considerations within the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) for this site which have fed into the emerging Local Plan and site allocations, it is apparent that the main disbenefits to this site were the likely major infrastructure works required to enable access. However, the proposed access via Bevills Close was not considered as part of this assessment and as set out in the main report the LHA has not raised objections to this proposed access. In addition, the numbers of dwellings for the site considered in the SHELAA was 60 dwellings.

Therefore, in summary, the detailed scheme being considered under this full application is different to the matters considered under the SHELAA, particularly with

regards to the potential for site access.

Comments from the Local Highway Authority

The LHA was asked to review the suggested conditions particularly the one related to submission of further highway design information and the CMP. The LHA has responded as follows;

The CMP as previously stated is acceptable for this application. Also, I have reviewed the documents and the other conditions added to this application. The conditions are acceptable.

Recommendation:

APPROVE – The above update does not alter the Officer recommendation found on page 51 of the agenda