



"Within the built form of Small Settlements, development will be supported 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".

The policy needs to be read in conjunction with the supporting text which precedes the policy text. This clearly defines the extent of the built form, essentially limiting development to 'infill' parcels only. It clearly states that gardens, paddocks, and other undeveloped land on the edge of the small settlements is not part of the built form. There is not therefore a "relaxation" of previous policy guidance relating to development in settlements such as Station End.

Furthermore, the Draft Local Plan makes a clear distinction between Turvey and Station End. It identifies Turvey as a Rural Service Centre which will need to deliver 25 – 50 dwellings; the supporting evidence and consultation drafts before, acknowledge that greenfield sites, outside of the settlement boundary will be required to deliver this. The Plan identifies Station End as a Small Settlement (contrary to its description as a "Significant Settlement" within the Overall Approach to the Neighbourhood Plan) where development is limited to that within the built form; the Plan does not specify an amount of housing to be provided here owing to the sustainability of the settlement.

Whilst it is accepted that Station End falls within Turvey Parish boundary and is therefore included within the Neighbourhood Plan Area, it is clear from the Draft Local Plan that the housing numbers directed to Turvey, relate to Turvey itself, they should not be met on sites at Station End. The Overall Approach proposed for the Neighbourhood Plan therefore fails to reflect the strategic policies of the emerging Local Plan, and as such would not meet the Basic Conditions set out in National Planning Policy if development was focused at Station End.

The proposed Overall Approach to the Neighbourhood Plan reports that there has been a change in approach to the distance of development from services and facilities. This is not the case as has clearly been demonstrated through the recent appeal decision at Station End (Ref: APP/K0235/W/16/3161915)

The suitability of all sites will be reviewed in the light of AECOM site assessments and Turvey NDP site selection criteria. Interpretation of Policy 5 of the emerging Local Plan will be clarified through consultation with the Borough Council if necessary

All comments that follow in this section in regard the Station End small settlement including Land off Station Road are noted and will be taken into account in the course of NDP site assessments.

The Inspector, determining the appeal, on behalf of the Secretary of State, advised that there was a clear distinction between Turvey and Turvey Station End. He advised that whilst connected by a footpath "these routes are not short enough to lead me to any different conclusion other than Turvey Station End is a separate settlement to Turvey".

He went on to state: "whilst Turvey Station End has a nursery, children's play area and an employment use operating from the Station House its existing services and employment opportunities are limited.

Even if I were to accept that the proposed shop was viable and would remain so, it would be a small single retail unit which would meet only a small part of day to day retail needs. The fact remains, that due to the limited services and employment opportunities in Turvey Station End occupiers of the proposed dwellings would need to travel to larger settlements to meet the majority of their employment and day to day needs.....

..... I acknowledge that Turvey offers some local services and employment within a reasonable walking and cycling distance. I also note the improvements in the wider strategic highway network have reduced traffic along Bedford Road. However, even after the proposed improvements including footpath widening, a pedestrian crossing and speed reduction the route is adjacent to a busy road and is unlit for the majority of its length. Thus, in my view this route would be unattractive to the occupiers of the proposed development particularly at night and the public footpaths across the countryside would only be attractive in good weather and in the day time".

The Inspector concluded: For these reasons, whilst I have considered the travel plan, I find the occupiers of the proposed dwellings in this location would rely on the private car to access the majority of their day to day services and employment, which is the least sustainable mode of transport.

The Inspector was clear that the development at Station End was unsustainable in locational terms owing to the reliance on the private car to access the services and facilities in Turvey. It is unclear why, with this evidence to hand, the NPG is considering sites in this location.

In addition to the above, Turvey Parish Council has itself objected to development at Station End on the grounds of locational sustainability. The extract below is taken from the Parish Council's objection to the proposed development of 49 dwellings at Station Road (the site the subject of the appeal described above).

Turvey Parish Council strongly object to this proposal, for the same reasons as the previous housing plans. Our objections can be listed as below:

1. We do not consider that this is a suitable site for a large development of new housing - it is our opinion that this development is of far too excessive density.
2. It is out of scale with the size of the present settlement and would overwhelm the community and change its appearance and character to its detriment.
3. The sustainability of the development;
  - a. There is a gross lack of infrastructure to support it.
  - b. The site is inappropriate for a relatively large residential estate.
  - c. The increase in car passages.
  - d. The increase in traffic using the Station Road A428 junction, which is not safe currently.
  - e. The footpath is unsafe to the main part of the village.
  - f. The broadband provision is woefully inadequate at present, with download speeds of between 2 and 4 Mbps at best. The demands of a further 47 dwellings and a shop would reduce this to unusable levels. There is a plan to provide superfast optical fibre to Turvey, but Station End is serviced from a cabinet 1.6km away, so this would still result in an unusable service. If permission were to be granted for this application the provision of superfast fibre all the way to Station End (via additional cabinet) must be included in any Section 106 agreement.
4. The proposed shop would be unlikely to be economically viable and risk the sustainability of the three shops in the main part of the village.

Many of these points were recorded as the reasons for the dismissal of an appeal by Coleman properties in 2007 for a similar development (APP/W0205/A/07/2039393);

- 1. Density/impact and detriment to character of the existing community:
  - 1.1 We are concerned that this development is of too high a density. 49 dwellings is the largest number yet proposed. The previous proposal rejected and subsequently dismissed at appeal was for only 39 dwellings.
  - 1.2 The dwellings would substantially outnumber the existent dwellings in Station End and overwhelm the small community.
  
- 2. Sustainability:
  - 2.1 We strongly contend that the development proposed is not sustainable and thus inappropriate for the location. Local services could not cope with this added pressure.
  - 2.2 This is comprehensively stated in the 2007 appeal decision, the relevant section of which is inserted below. Nothing has changed since this decision was made.

Again, on the basis of the Parish Council’s previous comments on the locational sustainability of Station End, it is unclear why the NPG is considering sites at Station End as being capable of meeting the requirement in the Basic Conditions to deliver sustainable development.

**Site Selection Criteria**

Comments;

Criteria 1. It is considered that the response to this question should be a simple yes or no. What will constitute a ‘potential’? There is either scope or there isn’t. The Criteria requires amendment to reflect this.

Criteria 2. The need to ensure that development does not impact highway safety is supported however, it is unclear how an exacerbation of traffic congestion pinch points will be determined/defined and what evidence will be produced to identify the pinch points. In addition, how will “Good”, “Reasonable” and “Poor” be measured?

Furthermore, we would contend that if a site has been considered for development without a highways objection, from the Highways

Noted - current wording preferred

Revised to ‘Is the site capable of development without **compromising traffic flow/safety** in the village ?’

	<p>Authority, then it is reasonable to conclude that it has been robustly assessed in terms of highways.</p> <p>Criteria 3. The assessment responses proposed to measure whether the site can be absorbed sympathetically within the village does not reflect the nature of the question. Whether the land has 'multiple sides to the village', is 'adjacent' or not 'adjacent' does not determine whether it can be absorbed sympathetically. It is considered that neither the question nor the assessment responses are helpful in assessing the site. It is suggested that the question is amended to ask 'Does the site adjoin the settlement boundary?' with a simple yes or no response, or is deleted in its entirety.</p> <p>The Inspector's commentary (detailed above), and the emerging Local Plan definitions of the settlements, both which confirm that Turvey and Station End are separate settlements, is relevant to this assessment.</p> <p>Criteria 4. It is questioned how the NPG will define both a "significant negative impact" and "a valued landscape". What evidence will be used/prepared to inform this?</p> <p>It should be noted that Case Law which addresses what constitutes a values landscape states that "to be valued would require the site to show some demonstrable physical attribute rather than just popularity".</p> <p>Criteria 5. As with Criteria 4, it is questioned how the NPG will define a "significant negative impact on the setting of historic building" and what evidence will be used to inform this decision making.</p> <p>Criteria 6. It is considered that the assessment response to this criterion should be a simple 'yes' or 'no'. Criteria 4 already seeks to assess Landscape Value. It is not necessary to include it again here, nor does it respond to the question being posed.</p> <p>Criteria 7. No comments. The question and the assessment responses seem appropriate.</p> <p>Criteria 8. The village core needs to be defined and should incorporate the school as this is a key day to day service for residents to access. The assessment responses are considered appropriate. As discussed below, it is considered that this Criteria is one which should be weighted.</p>	<p>Revised to 'Can the site can be absorbed sympathetically <b><u>with the built areas of the Parish</u></b> (e.g., adjacent to existing built area <b><u>or SPA</u></b>) ?'</p> <p>Agree adjacent/not adjacent does not determine, but referenced as 'for example' as it may be a factor</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted but current approach preferred</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Distance from the village core will be measured as from the War Memorial</p>
--	--	--

	<p>Criteria 9. "Any constraints" needs to be defined beyond "Tree Protection Orders, etc." In addition, it is considered that the assessment responses should be amended with "None" extended to "None/Doesn't impact development of site".</p> <p>Criteria 10. As above, this needs to be assessed in terms of whether flooding impacts the development of the site.</p> <p>Criteria 11. It is questioned how the NPG will assess "encroachment into open countryside", particularly given that there is an acknowledgement at Borough and Neighbourhood level that greenfield sites, on land currently designated countryside, will need to be allocated.</p> <p>Criteria 12. The assessment responses are considered appropriate.</p> <p>Criteria 13. It is considered that the question should be amended to 'Is the site deliverable within the neighbourhood plan period?' in order to better reflect National Planning Policy.</p> <p><b><u>Site Selection Criteria Discussion Document – Criteria</u></b></p> <p><u>Comments</u></p> <p><u>3rd bullet point:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The suggestion to identify primary and secondary criteria is supported. As referred to above it is considered that Criteria 8 (extended to include accessibility to the school), and Criteria 12 should be given more weight. This would reflect the level of weight the Inspector examining the Station Road appeal (discussed above) gave to accessibility to services and facilities.</li> </ul> <p>ADDITIONAL INFORMATION</p>	<p>Noted – existing wording preferred</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Revised criteria to state 'deliverable' instead of 'achievable'</p> <p>Weighting approach to criteria to be based on primary and secondary criteria arrived at via feedback from consultation and professional advice Criteria 2 to 6 preferred as primary criteria</p>
--	---	---

