

LAND SOUTH WEST OF CASTLESIDE COTTAGE, ASHKIRK - 21/01618/FUL AND 22/00041/RREF

RESPONSE TO LOCAL REVIEW BODY REQUEST FOR FURTHER INFORMATION – COMMENTS ON THE IMPACT OF NATIONAL PLANNING FRAMEWORK 4 ON THE PLANNING APPLICATION AND SUBSEQUENT REVIEW

The relevant policies from NPF4 are noted below, with officer commentary on their relevance, and a conclusion below

Relevant NPF policy	Commentary
Policy 3: Biodiversity	This requires, at part (a) and (c) that all developments contribute to biodiversity enhancement. This would be satisfied by a landscaping scheme, imposed by condition, that includes measures to improve habitat, or by measures on the building or nearby trees to provide for bat/bird boxes.
Policy 4: Natural Places	This seeks to safeguard designated ecological sites and protected species. This proposal is not in conflict with it
Policy 9: Brownfield, vacant and derelict land and empty buildings	This supports brownfield development, and does not support greenfield development unless the proposal is explicitly supported by policies in the LDP. This application is for the development of greenfield land, but this is supported by LDP Policy HD2 since it is a site suitable for expanding the building group. Therefore, the proposal is not in conflict with this policy
Policy 12: Zero Waste	Parts a) to c) are relevant. Though the application does not contain information sufficient to allow consideration against most of their requirements, there is no direct conflict with the policy in itself. No demolition is required on the site, and the layout contains scope to site bin storage which can be required by planning condition.
Policy 14: Design, Quality and Place	This requires that developments improve the quality of an area in their design impacts, and that they meet the six qualities of successful places. In this case, most relevant is that the development is 'distinctive'. This requires that developments support " <i>attention to detail of local architectural styles and natural landscapes to be interpreted, literally or creatively, into designs to reinforce identity.</i> " It is not considered that this proposed development would comply with this policy since it demonstrates an apparent lack of attention to local architectural styles within the building group in its design and external materials
Policy 17: Rural Homes	This policy supports homes in rural areas where they are suitably scaled, sited and designed to be in " <i>keeping with the character of the area</i> ", and where the development meets one of the criteria. This

	proposal is not appropriate to the character of the area, and it is not compliant in principle with Policy 17 as it does not fit with any of the policy criteria.
Policy 18: Infrastructure First	This requires that impacts on infrastructure be mitigated. This can be addressed by a legal agreement for a contribution to the Waverley Line reinstatement, as noted in the Report of Handling
Policy 22: Flood Risk and Water Management	This requires that developments at risk of flooding not be supported, unless meeting the policy criteria, which this proposal does not. However, as per the Report of Handling, flood risk to the development itself is not a concern, as the indicative risk extends only to its corner. The policy also requires consideration of surface water management and water supply, and the proposal does not conflict with these requirements, subject to planning conditions (as noted in the Report of Handling).
Policy 23: Health and Safety	This includes a requirement for air quality impacts to be addressed, though an Informative Note can refer to obligations on the applicant as regards stove emissions, as per the Report of Handling.

Conclusion

The principle of the proposed development is not supported by NPF4 since rural housing in the countryside requires compliance with criteria in Policy 17, which this proposed development does not meet. However, as NPF4 is only part of the statutory development plan, this does not undermine the principle of development, since Local Development Plan Policy HD2 supports housing within building groups. Given that LDP Policy HD2 is not directly contradictory to Policy 17, but complementary to it, the principle of the development is compliant with the development plan as a whole.

However, as noted above, the proposal is not considered compliant with policies 14 and 17 because the design and materials of the proposed development are not appropriate to the character of the building group. NPF4, therefore, reinforces the reasons for refusal already stated in the original decision notice and officer's Report of Handling.