

## Turvey Neighbourhood Plan Aims, Policies, Site Selection Criteria Consultation

### Feedback from DLP on behalf of Snelsons Farms

Topic	Comments	Response to comments
<b>Aims</b>	No comments offered	
<b>Policy Areas</b>	No comments offered	
<b>Site Selection Criteria</b>	<p><b><u>Site Selection Criteria Discussion document - Overall Approach</u></b></p> <p><u>1<sup>st</sup> bullet point</u></p> <p><i>'Generally, planning policy and practice encourages the principle that new development should be within, or adjacent to, designated settlement policy area (SPA) boundaries. Our proposed approach supports that principle, with an exception option for Station End.'</i></p> <p><u>Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We agree with this approach in principle but it is important to recognise that there is a difference between a policy defined settlement envelope which will have been determined as a means of controlling (restricting) development, and the functional area of the village – being the land which the community recognises is part of the settlement and the way it functions. Therefore the Village Playing Field and the Cemetery are part of the village and recognised as such but for the purposes of defining a Settlement Policy Area Boundary are excluded – to prevent pressure for their redevelopment.</li> <li>• Accordingly the definition above should not preclude the Committee considering sites which are adjoining the functional boundary of the village on its northern fringe where it abuts the Playing Field even though the Playing Field is not within the SPA – but is protected by</li> </ul>	<p style="color: red;">Judgement will be used to ensure that the way specific items are rated does not have a perverse impact on the overall rating of any site.</p> <p>Noted</p>

	<p>existing Local Plan Policy AD40 and can be protected by policies within the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p><u>2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point</u></p> <p><i>'The Station End settlement is some distance beyond the village SPA boundary and does not have its own designated SPA. However, it is a significant settlement in its own right and development sites have been submitted by landowners. We believe these sites should be judged on their own merits and not excluded simply because they are outside the village settlement boundary.'</i></p> <p><u>Comments;</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We have no specific view on this but consider that the comments on development adjoining the SPA apply equally here</li> </ul> <p><u>3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point</u></p> <p><i>'The Station End settlement is some distance beyond the village SPA boundary and does not have its own designated SPA. However, it is a significant settlement in its own right and development sites have been submitted by landowners. We believe these sites should be judged on their own merits and not excluded simply because they are outside the village settlement boundary.'</i></p> <p><u>Comments;</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Car use is a fact of life and planning policy has not diminished this. Equally, without new development rural communities go into decline as populations' age and the occupancy rate of houses continues to decline. New housing can breathe life into a community, help support existing services and facilities and encourage new ones to start.</li> <li>• In that respect it is important that people can get round the community easily and that walking distances are reasonable. This tends to suggest that sites that can be easily and safely accessed by foot to and from village facilities such as the Post Office, shops, school, Hall and pub should be preferred. This is especially important for the elderly and those with young children and suggests that consideration should be</li> </ul>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	--	--

	<p>given to locating development where the walking distance to daily facilities is shortest – and even taking into account sites that avoid needing to cross the High Street.</p> <p><u>4<sup>th</sup> bullet point</u></p> <p><i>'The current draft Local Plan allows for a relaxation of this policy. Policy 5 proposes that development will be supported 'within specified Small Settlements (which includes Station End) where the proposal contributes positively to the character of the settlement and is appropriate to the structure, form, character and size of the settlement as a whole.'</i></p> <p><u>Comments;</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A representation of support to the Borough Plan has been submitted insofar as it identifies that some planned development should be allowed in Turvey through the Neighbourhood Plan.</li> </ul> <p><u>5<sup>th</sup> bullet point;</u></p> <p><i>'In the Parish Consultation event on sites for development submitted to the Council (January 2017), where people were in favour of development, a significant majority said that developments of less than 30 houses in any single location were preferred to larger developments.'</i></p> <p><u>Comments;</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further to a meeting between representatives of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and Snelson's Farms we have reviewed the draft scheme that was tabled. The tabled scheme provided for in the order of 40 dwellings and demonstrated that this could incorporate all of the social and affordable housing need identified in the Housing Needs Study.</li> <li>• We have subsequently considered whether a smaller number of dwellings could meet a proportionately smaller element of the identified housing need. Our conclusion is that it could however that a development of fewer than 20 dwellings would be subject to other Planning Obligations such that it would have a diminished ability to meet</li> </ul>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	---	--



Carlton Road as has been discussed we ask that it allows for at least 20 dwellings to ensure a viable and meaningful contribution towards meeting the requirements identified in the Housing Needs Survey.

**Site Selection Criteria Discussion Document – Criteria**

1<sup>st</sup> bullet point;

*'The criteria will be used to measure the positives and negatives of each site so that the balance of positive and negative attributes can be considered and compared, resulting in the identification of best preferred sites.'*

Comments;

- Noted

2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point;

*'The criteria cover a wide range of areas, some practical, some technical, some expressing local priorities. We need to get the right mix to make sure all relevant issues are taken into account.'*

Comments;

- Noted
- With regard to comments above, local pedestrian accessibility should also be a criteria to which weight should be attached as accepting that trips outside the village will largely be made by car, proximity and quality of footpaths is important to discourage people from using cars for very short trips within the village itself – as per the notes following the criteria.

2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point;

*'One option we have is to give some items more weight than others. We could do this by identifying some of the criteria as 'primary' and some as 'secondary'. This would enable us to give more weight to specific criteria which are seen to be of greater significance than others.'*

Noted

	<p><u>Comments;</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We consider that local accessibility and the ability to avoid impacting on the amenity of existing residents should be significant criteria for consideration – the latter has been recognised by Lord Matthew Taylor of Goss Moor who was commissioned by Government to review the workings of Planning Guidance.</li> <li>• Arising from this we have considered the assessment of the land east of Carlton Road against the Draft Criteria</li> </ul> <p><b>Site Selection Criteria</b></p> <p><b>Land East of Carlton Road – Agent comments</b></p> <p>Criteria 1. <i>'Does the site have scope for safe and adequate vehicular access?'</i></p> <p>The site has an existing (ungated) agricultural access. It would be possible to locate a vehicular access along the frontage at a point that would achieve the Highway Authority's full visibility splays including provision for a footway</p> <p>Potential</p> <p>Criteria 2. <i>'Is the site capable of development without exacerbation of traffic congestion pinch points in the village (Carlton Road/The Loop, Newton Lane/High St.)?'</i></p> <p>Preliminary advice from a professional highway consultant indicates that there is capacity for additional traffic movements at the junction of Carlton Road and The Loop having regard to the likely scale of development and to the proximity of the primary school which is accessible from the site on foot.</p> <p>Good</p> <p>Criteria 3. <i>'Can the site can be absorbed sympathetically within the village (e.g., adjacent to existing built area) ?'</i></p>	<p>Noted</p> <p><u>The remaining comments are not understood to be comments on the construction of the criteria.</u></p> <p><u>They are understood as the views of the agent in respect of their rating of the site on Land East of Carlton Road against the Criteria.</u></p> <p><u>As such, they will be referred to as supporting comments from the agent for site assessment purposes only.</u></p>
--	---	---

The development would not abut gardens of any existing residential properties nor would development directly affect the amenity of any existing village residents. Access to the site would not be along a residential street or cul de sac but would be directly to one of the principal roads most able to take additional traffic flows. It would however be visible from and 'read' as part of the village where through design, dwellings could face onto and enjoy the benefits of overlooking the village playing fields

Adjacent

Criteria 4. *'Would development of the site have significant negative impact on valued landscapes and settings?'*

Land north of the village is not of notable quality – it is neither part of the parkland areas or river valley from which the village and its setting derive much of its character. Nor does it share the character of the prevailing area described as "Small to medium scale landscape with an enclosed, peaceful character" as the site is part of a large open agricultural field with few if any retained features.

The LCA notes that it is part of the Pavenham Wolds but well away from any of the key visual features (Fig 15) and would not affect any of the Visual Sensitivities identified in the Report. Low

Criteria 5. *'Would development of the site have significant negative impact on the settings of historic buildings (where the open landscape setting is fundamental to the historic building(s)) ?'*

No. The LCA notes that land north of Turvey is well away from any of the key visual features (Fig 15) and would not affect any of the Visual Sensitivities identified in the Report.

The nearest and only listed building is Turvey Top Lodge however this lies opposite the Cemetery and has no visual connection with the land to the north, east of Carlton Road.

The scheme would not develop housing on the Carlton Road frontage. It would be set back by at least 50m (the width of the Cemetery), therefore it would have no affect or impact on Turvey Park.

Low

Criteria 6. *'Is this a Brownfield site ?'*

No

Greenfield

Criteria 7. *'Does the site have high agricultural grade ?'*

The general ALC Map shows the land to be Grade 3. It is believed to be 3c on account of the predominantly boulder clay soils overlying limestone. It is therefore not best and most versatile land where there is a presumption in favour of resisting loss to other uses.

The site is part of a large agricultural holding and its loss to farm use would have negligible effect on the viability of continued farming of the remainder.

3

Criteria 8. *'Is the site close to the village core, so as to support local community facilities ?'*

Land at Carlton Road is approximately 360m from the village school either via the right of way across the Playing Field and May Road or via the proposed site entrance and Carlton Road (taking into account the set-back noted at 5 above).

It is about 525m from the Post Office and Corner Stores

500m-1,000m

Criteria 9. *'Are there any constraints (Tree Protection Orders, etc.) ?'*

No

None

	<p>Criteria 10. <i>'Is there risk of flooding ?'</i></p> <p>No</p> <p>Low</p> <p>Criteria 11. <i>'Would development of the site lead to encroachment into open countryside ?'</i></p> <p>The scheme prepared for discussion shows how a new village boundary would be created through planting which would also be a net benefit to wildlife were the field presently has few if any natural features.</p> <p>The overall scale of the site is very limited in relation to the open landscape character of the present field and the impact of development would be nominal</p> <p>Low</p> <p>Criteria 12. <i>'Is the site in close proximity to public transport ?'</i></p> <p>At High Street</p> <p>500m-1,000m</p> <p>Criteria 13. <i>'Is the site available within the neighbourhood plan period ?'</i></p> <p>Yes</p>	
--	--	--