REPORT TO INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES COMMITTEE – 20 JUNE 2019

Reference No: APP/2018/2217

Full Planning Permission for Erection of Dwellinghouse at Land at Beech Hedges, Stuartfield, Aberdeenshire.

Applicant: Mr and Mrs S Scott c/o Agent
Agent: Baxter Design Company, 1 The Square, Mintlaw, Peterhead. AB42 5EH

Grid Ref: E:397925 N:845981
Ward No. and Name: W04 – Central Buchan
Application Type: Full Planning Permission
Representations: 0
Consultations: 5
Relevant Proposals Map: Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2017
Designations: RHMA
Complies with Development Plans: No
Main Recommendation: Refuse

1. Reason for Report

1.1 The Committee is able to consider and take a decision on this item in terms of Section F.4.1 of Part 2A List of Committee Powers and Section C.3.1d of Part 2C Planning Delegations of the Scheme of Governance as the application is a local development, where in the professional opinion of the Head of Planning and Building Standards, approval would be a significant departure from the Development Plan and the Area Committee have decided to approve the application.

1.2 The Head of Finance and Monitoring Officer within Business Services have been consulted in the preparation of this Report, their comments are incorporated within the Report and are satisfied that the Report complies with the Scheme of Governance and relevant legislation.

2. Principal Planning Issues (Summary)

2.1 The principal planning issue in relation to this proposal is the conflict with the terms of Policy R2 Housing and employment development elsewhere in the countryside contained in the Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2017.
2.2 The proposed development is a departure from Policy R2 Housing and employment development elsewhere in the countryside. Stuartfield is a settlement identified for small scale growth, and under Policy R2, is permitted a maximum growth of up to 10 new houses within the current Plan period (post 17 April 2017) provided these houses are within 200 metres of the settlement boundary. At the time of writing 11 dwelling houses have been approved under this criteria at Stuartfield within the current Plan period. This includes application APP/2018/2911 for the erection of 2 dwellings (one being a change of house type to an approved design and a further additional dwelling which was approved following Infrastructure Services Committee on 16 May 2019. Therefore, the settlement has no further capacity for growth as an identified settlement. Appendix 4 shows these recent approvals. All other material considerations have been taken into account in arriving at this recommendation.

2.3 A full discussion of the proposed development is contained in the Buchan Area Committee Report from the meeting of 23 April 2019 which is attached as Appendix 2.

3. Representations (Summary)

3.1 No representations have been received.

4. Area Committee Decision (Summary)

4.1 At their meeting on 23 April 2019, the Buchan Area Committee agreed to approve the application, against the recommendation of the Planning Service, subject to appropriate planning conditions, delegated matters and referral to the Infrastructure Services Committee for final determination. An extract of the Minute of the Buchan Area Committee is attached as Appendix 3.

4.2 The following documents are attached as appendices to this Report:

- Appendix 1A: Location Plan
- Appendix 1B: Site Plan
- Appendix 2: Copy of the Buchan Area Committee Report dated 23 April 2019
- Appendix 3: Extract of Minute of the Buchan Area Committee meeting of 23 April 2019
- Appendix 4: Plan and list of all houses approved within 200m of Stuartfield post 17 April 2017, and applications pending consideration at Infrastructure Services Committee on 16 May 2019

5. Implications and Risk

5.1 An Equality Impact Assessment is not required because the proposals do not have a differential impact on any of the protected characteristics.
5.2 There are no staffing and financial implications.

5.3 There are no risks identified in respect of this matter in terms of the Corporate and Directorate Risk Registers as the Committee is considering the application as the Planning Authority in a quasi-judicial role and must determine the application on its own merits in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations justify a departure.

6. Officer Recommendation

6.1 REFUSE Full Planning Permission for planning application reference APP/2018/2911 for the following reason: -

1. The proposal fails to comply with Policy R2 Housing and employment development elsewhere in the countryside of the Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2017. There is no remaining capacity for the expansion of Stuartfield under the Organic Growth criteria, and the proposed development does not meet any other criteria of Policy R2, and therefore the proposal is contrary to the provisions within the Local Development Plan.

6.2 Should the Infrastructure Services Committee wish to GRANT Full Planning Permission it is recommended that authority should be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Standards subject to:

   a) Conclusion of Developer Obligations
   b) Conditions to cover the following matters:

1. Roads and access
2. Foul and surface water drainage and public water supply arrangements
3. Energy Statement
4. Boundary enclosures and Landscaping

For noting:-

Part 2C (Planning Delegations) states at Section C.3.2b for Local Development, that following consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the determining Committee, the Head of Planning and Building Standards can refuse planning applications for which Section 75 Agreements are not completed or Developer Obligations are not paid within four months from the date of the Committee at which the application is determined. Local Ward Members shall be notified of any such refusal.
Please note that this power may be exercised in respect of the application which is the
subject of this report if the application is approved by the Committee.

Stephen Archer
Director of Infrastructure Services
Author of Report: Sally Wood, Senior Planner
Report Date: 7 May 2019
Buchan Area Committee Report 23 April 2019

Reference No: APP/2018/2217

Full Planning Permission for Erection of Dwellinghouse at Land at Beech Hedges Stuartfield, Aberdeenshire

Applicant: Mr & Mrs S Scott, c/o Agent
Agent: Baxter Design Company, 1 The Square, Mintlaw, Peterhead. AB42 5EH

Grid Ref: E:397925 N:845981
Ward No. and Name: W04 Central Buchan
Application Type: Full Planning Permission
Representations: 0
Consultations: 5
Relevant Proposals
Map: Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2017
Designations: RHMA
Complies with Development Plans: No
Main Recommendation: Refuse
1. **Reason for Report**

1.1 The Committee is able to consider and take a decision on this item in terms of Section B.8.1 of Part 2A List of Committee Powers and Section C.3.1i of Part 2C Planning Delegations of the Scheme of Governance as the application is recommended for refusal but at least two Local Ward Members in the Ward in which the development is proposed, have requested that the application be referred to the Area Committee.

Cllr. Norman Smith – To further discuss Policy R2
Cllr. Jim Ingram – To give further consideration to the site and Policy R2
Cllr. Anne Simpson – To further discuss Policy R2 and the proposed location of the development

1.2 The Head of Finance and Monitoring Officer within Business Services have been consulted in the preparation of this report and are satisfied that the report complies with the Scheme of Governance and relevant legislation.

2. **Background and Proposal**

2.1 This application seeks full planning permission for the erection of a detached dwellinghouse, and domestic garage/workshop at Land at Beech Hedges, Stuartfield (See Appendix 1 for Location Plan and Appendix 2 for Site Plan).

2.2 It is proposed to erect a contemporary style 4 bedroom dwelling house that shall be located at the centre of the plot, with an ‘H’-shaped footprint. The property measures a footprint of approximately 310 m² and is single storey in height, with an overall maximum ridge height 6.7 metres, external finishes for the walls include off-white harl, natural stone and dark brown Cedral Cladding, with a roof covering of slate. Windows are doors are proposed to be finished in an Anthracite Grey colour. (Refer to Appendix 3 for Elevations)

2.3 The proposed dwelling shall create 4 bedrooms (two with en-suite), a lounge, kitchen/diner, snug room, and bathroom. A decked area is proposed to the front (West) and rear (East) in addition to a Veranda to the front. An integral double garage is proposed on the northern elevation. The design includes various pitched roof at similar heights that lie perpendicular to each other, as well as large glazed features specifically on projecting gables to the west, which have over-sailing roof with angular bays. In addition, the house comprises rooflights to allow light into the upper floor attic, which is served by a staircase, and three solar panels on the south west elevation. (Refer to Appendix 4 for Floor Plans)

2.4 It is also proposed to erect a detached garage/workshop directly to the north of the dwellinghouse for domestic use. The detached garage/workshop shall measure approximately 68 m² and a ridge height of 5.3 metres. The building
would have a pitched roof and rectangular footprint, the garage door would be located on the south elevation.

2.5 The application plot is currently agricultural land with a mature Beech hedge and dry stone boundary wall that runs along the western boundary. The site lies on land that slopes from north to south. Agricultural land surrounds the site to the north, east and west with the Stuartfield Settlement Area approximately 120 metres to the west (at its closest point). Land to the south of the site is also currently of agricultural use but it is worth noting that numerous applications for the erection of dwellinghouses have been approved along the course of the private road. It was noted that construction is currently underway with some of these approved houses to the south of the application site.

2.6 A new access to the plot is proposed to be taken via an existing private road which facilitates the existing and proposed dwellings at present. The plot shall be serviced via new private drainage arrangements, including a new septic tank and discharge soakaways. Details of the private drainage system have been provided by way of drawing layouts, a drainage report and associated calculations to support the application.

2.7 There has been a previous planning application on part of the site, not the whole site. Planning application reference APP/2015/2425 for Planning Permission in Principle for the Erection of a Dwellinghouse and Garage, was granted subject to conditions 28 September 2015. It is noted that this consent expired in September 2018. This current application includes land that was not subject to that application.

2.8 In support of the application the following documents have been submitted:

- Design Statement (18064) (undated).
- Drainage Report, Recommendations and Associated Test Certificates, dated 12 August 2018.

3. Representations

3.1 None

4. Consultations

4.1 Business Services (Developer Obligations) note that contributions have been previously secured under APP/2015/2425 via a S69 Legal Agreement and therefore, in this instance, no contribution is required.

Education & Children’s Services (Education) has no objection to the application. Noting that an extension to increase the capacity is being built at Stuartfield School due to continued house building in the catchment, and mitigation will be required.
Infrastructure Services (Contaminated Land) upon receipt of further information on the former use of the site, where there is no indication of any past use which might have caused contamination, advised that have no further comment on the application.

Infrastructure Services (Roads Development) has no objection to the proposal subject to planning conditions being attached should planning permission be granted.

Scottish Water has no objection to the proposal. It advised that there is sufficient capacity at the Turriff Water Treatment Works and Stuartfield Waste Water Treatment Works.

5. Relevant Planning Policies

5.1 Scottish Planning Policy

The aim of the Scottish Planning Policies is to ensure that development and changes in land use occur in suitable locations and are sustainable. The planning system must also provide protection from inappropriate development. Its primary objectives are:

- to set the land use framework for promoting sustainable economic development;
- to encourage and support regeneration; and
- to maintain and enhance the quality of the natural heritage and built environment.

Development and conservation are not mutually exclusive objectives; the aim is to resolve conflicts between the objectives set out above and to manage change. Planning policies and decisions should not prevent or inhibit development unless there are sound reasons for doing so. The planning system guides the future development and use of land in cities, towns and rural areas in the long term public interest. The goal is a prosperous and socially just Scotland with a strong economy, homes, jobs and a good living environment for everyone.

5.2 Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan 2014

The purpose of this Plan is to set a clear direction for the future development of the North East. It promotes a spatial strategy. All parts of the Strategic Development Plan area will fall within either a strategic growth area or a local growth and diversification area. Some areas are also identified as regeneration priority areas. There are also general objectives identified. In summary, these cover promoting economic growth, promoting sustainable economic development which will reduce carbon dioxide production, adapt to the effects of climate change and limit the amount of non-renewable resources used, encouraging population growth, maintaining and improving the region’s built, natural and cultural assets, promoting sustainable communities and improving accessibility in developments.
From the 29 March 2019, the Strategic Development Plan 2014 will be beyond its five-year review period. In light of this, for proposals which are regionally or strategically significant, or give rise to cross boundary issues between Aberdeen City and Aberdeenshire, the presumption in favour of development that contributes to sustainable development will be a significant material consideration in line with Scottish Planning Policy 2014.

The Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2017 will continue to be the primary document against which applications are considered. The Proposed Aberdeen City & Shire SDP 2020 may also be a material consideration.

5.3 Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2017

Policy R2 Housing and employment development elsewhere in the countryside
Policy P1 Layout, siting and design
Policy P4 Hazardous and potentially polluting developments and contaminated land
Policy E2 Landscape
Policy C1 Using resources in buildings
Policy RD1 Providing suitable services
Policy RD2 Developers’ obligations
Policy PR1 Protecting Important Resources

5.4 Other Material Considerations

An Equalities Impact Assessment is not required because the proposed development is not considered to give rise to any differential impacts on those with protected characteristics.

6. Discussion

6.1 The main issues for consideration with regard to this application are whether the principle of development can be established for the development, under Policy R2 of the Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2017, and whether a house can be accommodated on the site without having an adverse impact on residential amenity, is appropriate in terms of design and there is sufficient infrastructure. Policy R2 potentially allows for the erection of a dwellinghouse where:

- Development appropriate in the greenbelt (see Policy R1: Special rural areas); or
- Development which involves the refurbishment or replacement, on the same site, of an existing house or disused building; or
- Development which involves remediation of redundant brownfield land opportunities; or
- Small scale growth to an identified settlement from appendix 4; or
- Viable retirement succession; or
• Addition to a cluster of a minimum of 5 existing dwellinghouses. Total additions must not surpass 20% of the existing total of houses or more than 2 new homes to the cluster within a plan period (Within Rural Housing Market Area only).

6.2 In this instance, the only criteria that the proposed development might have been able to meet would have been the Organic Growth criteria. Policy R2 allows for small scale growth of settlements, where a particular need for development has been identified, by the addition of groups of no more than 3 houses within 200 metres of the settlement boundary. Stuartfield is a settlement listed under Appendix 4 of the plan for this criteria. A maximum of 10 houses can be approved under this criteria of policy R2 within a plan period. There have been 10 approvals within 200 metres of Stuartfield since the Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2017 was adopted and consequently the principle of development cannot be established for this site.

6.3 Layout, siting and design

It is considered that the siting of the dwellinghouse is deemed acceptable and would sit comfortably within the context of the plot. There shall be approximately 1300m² of garden ground amenity space throughout the site which is more than adequate for a new build property. Although the footprint of the property is relatively large, it is considered that any impact is minimised due to the dwelling being single storey in height. The design incorporates features such as large high ceiling glazed windows throughout with a mixture of solar panels and roof lights on the upper floor. The proposed materials are appropriate for the rural setting and offer a welcome contrast in design to traditional steadings, thereby avoiding erosion of the character within this countryside location. It is considered that the use of the materials and proposed design features such as the natural slate roof covering and narrow gables enhance the design of the house. In addition, it is considered that the shape of the dwelling and the proposed roof pitch are appropriate in a rural setting, and replicates a traditional styled steading. The applicant has proposed an integrated garage for vehicle parking as well as a detached workshop/garage for domestic purposes as part of the proposal. The proposed dwelling is in keeping with the character of adjacent dwellings which vary in terms of size, layout, style and design, for example single storey and 1.5 storey high properties that comprise a variety of materials throughout. In addition, given the location of the dwelling and the distance to its boundary (20 metres to the southern boundary and 22 metres to the northern boundary) there is no issues with regards to overlooking and privacy. The proposed roof lights at first floor level do not create any issues in terms of overlooking given their location and the distance to the adjacent boundaries. It is also considered that there shall be no issues in terms of overshadowing given the distance to the neighbouring properties and plots. Subsequently, the Planning Service is content that the proposal creates no issues in terms of privacy or overshadowing. It is therefore considered that the proposal is acceptable under Policy P1 of the Local Development Plan.
6.4 **Levels and Landscaping**

The proposed site levels undulate throughout. The applicant has highlighted the proposed levels ranging from ground level 52.00 at the entrance to the site and raising slightly to FFL 53.57 at the proposed dwelling. Although the dwelling sits at a slightly higher level, it is considered that the proposal will sit comfortably with the character of the wider landscape, as the site naturally slopes.

6.5 The landscaping includes post and wire fenced boundaries and gravel areas for vehicle access throughout the site. The applicant has submitted details of the proposed trees and planting, specifically at the eastern boundary of the site. The submitted information is appropriate for a rural area and deemed acceptable. Taking the above into account, the proposal complies with Policy E2 Landscape of the Local Development Plan.

6.6 **Drainage and access**

The proposed private drainage systems have been supported by an appropriate geotechnical investigation report as well as calculations to determine the integrity of the proposal in relation to the land. The applicant proposes a septic tank which leads to soakaways (minimum 36 m$^2$) to accommodate the development. In addition, Scottish Water has not objected to the proposal, therefore it is considered to have met the requirements of Policy RD1 of the Local Development Plan.

6.7 The applicant has provided vehicle access details as part of the proposal in which our Roads Service deemed acceptable. The plans show access to the site via an existing private road with 45 degree visibility splays either side. The access will be finished with gravel, and will lead to a turning area and sufficient space for external parking. In addition, the applicant has proposed an integral garage that can accommodate an additional two vehicles within the site. The applicant has also submitted the proposed refuse location which is deemed acceptable within the site. It is considered that the proposal meets the requirements of RD1 of the Local Development Plan. Additionally, Developer Obligations have confirmed that no further payments are required in this instance, which complies with Policy RD2.

6.8 The Contaminated Land Team had requested consultation on the application as a result of the proposed site being formerly used for agriculture, which can have a history of contamination through the use of pesticides or other chemicals. Having received further information from the applicant on the former use of the site, Contaminated Land confirmed that there is no indication of any past use which might have caused contamination. It has no further comments on this application. The proposal is therefore deemed to comply with Policy P4.
6.9 **Other**

A condition can be applied to seek SAP calculations and appropriate technologies to ensure that the proposal is not in conflict with Policy C1 Using resources in buildings should the application meet all other policy tests.

6.10 The plot is located within an area classified as prime agricultural land and defined as class 3.1. Albeit, Policy PR1 within the Local Development Plan generally prohibits development on prime agricultural land under this class, it is noted that extant planning permission to the north and south of this site would leave a small parcel of prime agricultural land which would be rendered difficult to use with modern farm machinery. In this instance, and given these reasons, it is considered that the proposal would not be in conflict with Policy PR1, given the ability to access the land given the developments adjacent.

6.11 Notwithstanding the matters discussed above, the application is for full planning permission, and in this instance, as there is no remaining capacity for the expansion of Stuartfield under the Organic Growth criteria, and the proposed development does not meet any other criteria of Policy R2, the proposal is contrary to the Local Development Plan. Consequently the application is recommended for refusal.

7. **Area Implications**

7.1 None

8. **Implications and Risk**

8.1 An Equalities Impact Assessment is not required because the proposed development is not considered to give rise to any differential impacts on those with protected characteristics.

8.2 There are no staffing and financial implications.

8.3 There are no risks identified in respect of this matter in terms of the Corporate and Directorate Risk Registers as the Committee is considering the application as the planning authority in a quasi-judicial role and must determine the application on its own merits in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations justify a departure.

9. **Sustainability Implications**

9.1 No separate consideration of the current proposal’s degree of sustainability is required as the concept is implicit to and wholly integral with the planning process against the policies of which it has been measured.
10. **Departures, Notifications and Referrals**

10.1 **Strategic Development Plan Departures**

None

10.2 **Local Development Plan Departures**

Policy R2 Housing and employment development elsewhere in the countryside

10.3 The application is a Departure from the valid Local Development Plan and has been advertised as such. Any representations received have been circulated as part of the agenda and taken into account in recommending a decision. The period for receiving representations has expired.

10.4 The application does not fall within any of the categories contained in the Schedule of the Town and Country Planning (Notification of Applications) (Scotland) Direction 2009 and the application is not required to be notified to the Scottish Ministers prior to determination.

10.5 The proposed development is in the opinion of the Head of Planning and Building Standards in significant conflict with Policy R2 and if the Committee is minded to approve then the application will have to be referred to Infrastructure Services Committee.

11. **Recommendation**

11.1 **REFUSE Full Planning Permission for the following reason:-**

01. The proposal fails to comply with Policy R2 Housing and employment development elsewhere in the countryside of the Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2017. There is no remaining capacity for the expansion of Stuartfield under the Organic Growth criteria, and the proposed development does not meet any other criteria of Policy R2, and therefore the proposal is contrary to the provisions within the Local Development Plan.

Stephen Archer  
Director of Infrastructure Services  
Author of Report: Sally Wood  
Report Date: 27 March 2019
APPENDIX 3

ABERDEENSHIRE COUNCIL
BUCHAN AREA COMMITTEE
BUCHAN HOUSE, PETERHEAD, 23RD APRIL 2019

Present: Councillors N Smith (Chair), D Beagrie (Vice Chair), A Allan, A Buchan, M Buchan, S Calder, A Fakley, J Ingram, A Simpson, S Smith and Councillor I Sutherland

Officers: Chris White, Buchan Area Manager (Business Services); Iain Meredith, Senior Solicitor - Governance (Business Services); Sally Wood, Senior Planner (Infrastructure Services); Jonathan Duncan (via skype), Civil Engineer/Technician (Infrastructure Services); Nick Brown, Regeneration Executive (Business Services); Maureen Stephen, Area Committee Officer (Business Services); and Theresa Wood, Area Committee Officer (Business Services)

In Attendance: Craig Shand, Scottish Fire and Rescue Service

(b) Full Planning Permission for Erection of Dwellinghouse at Land at Beech Hedges, Stuartfield

For: Mr & Mrs S Scott, c/o Agent
Per: Baxter Design Company, 1 The Square, Mintlaw

Reference No: APP/2018/2217

In terms of Standing Order 6.5, the Area Manager had received a request to address the Committee in relation to this application from the Agent, Mr Ryan Urquhart.

The Committee was asked if they wished to hear the representation. The Committee unanimously agreed.

The Committee first heard from the Senior Planner who reminded the Committee that the proposed development is, in the opinion of the Head of Planning and Building Standards, in significant conflict with Policy R2 and therefore if the Committee is minded to approve the application then the application will have to be referred to Infrastructure Services Committee. The Committee then heard from Mr Ryan Urquhart –

"The site had planning permission in principle under Reference APP/2015/2425 as noted in the report, and as indicated by the purple outline on the screen. The site boundaries were changed as a result to a slight change to the deal in the purchase of Plot 1 to the south, a reduction from 1 acre to three quarters of an acre, so rather than leaving a gap between two of the plots it was decided that each plot could just be pulled down to the south so they still bound on to one another, resulting in the change to the red site boundary outline shown, but as you can see over three quarters of the site area is still within the planning permission in principle approved site, and the house and garage are wholly within this area. The only area outwith is a 10m strip of garden space to the south, bringing the plot boundary down to meet that of plot 2. I note that this application is for plot 3 in a row of 7 houses, all others have begun construction or have completed their house builds.

We submitted this plot in early September 2018 well in advance of the expiry of the planning in principle at the end of September, we submitted it as an MSC application linked to the PPIP but the Planning Service asked us to change the form to be a Full Planning application to the slight change in boundary. This has caused the issue as the Planning Service have taken the approach that because a simple change to the type of planning form and site boundary submitted treats this application as an additional house to that which was already approved. This only came to light when we submitted two further PPIP applications for new
houses, one to the north and one south of this site, which Councillors will be aware were refused as it was only then that although we believed there to be plenty of capacity left for organic growth of Stuartfield, the planners admitted that they had not kept records up to date and deemed that the village had already reached capacity of the 2017 Local Development allocation for organic growth. This is because they have doubled up counting plots 4, 5 and 6 to the north of this site, so even though their site boundaries slightly changed in their detailed applications they have counted them as additional houses in the organic growth policy, ie since the PPiPs were approved prior to 2017 they have then counted them as part of the 2017 allocation. This sounds very complex but it is down to interpretation of the organic growth policy, which is why we believed that there were plenty of allocations left otherwise we would not have wasted planning fees for our clients by applying for sites we didn’t believe should be approved.

This goes against the spirit of the policy, as the policy states no additional houses over the allocation of 10 houses per local plan period should be approved, this application clearly demonstrates there is no additional houses proposed to what has already been approved. As can be seen in Section 4.1 of the report, this also goes against consultee comments from Education and Development Obligations, who were consulted and agreed that mitigation to extend the school capacity was agreed as part of application 2015/2425 as the developer obligation contributions are already secured. So if this application is approved, and no development takes place as part of that approval, the owners can claim back the contribution and so the Council and community lose out. Since the Planning Service have re-counted plots 4, 5 and 6 to the north as well, the Council and community have missed out a further £4,000 of contributions through Organic Growth towards the school, which is entirely against the spirit of the Policy R2. The Roads Department comments also agreed that access was secured as part of the previous approval, and I note that there were no objections to this application. During the application we offered to remove the 10m southern strip of garden from consideration as that seemed to be causing the issue, and the Planning Service logic was that there are existing approved planning in principle sites at sites 4, 5 and 6 still valid from the 2012 LDP period which we offered to revoke to free up allocation, however, the Planning Service have not been receptive to any solution proposed.

We believe that the proposal does comply with Policy R2, and will have no additional Impact.”

The Committee unanimously agreed:-

(1) that being minded to Grant Full Planning Permission subject to relevant conditions, that the application be referred to Infrastructure Services Committee for determination, and

(2) their reasons for departing as follows –

(a) the site is an appropriate location for this type of development,

(b) given the number of houses that are already built along the section of road, the proposal represents organic growth to the east of the village, and

(c) the proposal is in-keeping with the location.
Approved Sites Within 200 metres of Stuartfield

APP/2016/1765
APP/2017/0350
APP/2017/0351
APP/2017/0352
APP/2017/1197
APP/2017/1192
APP/2017/1226
APP/2017/3047
APP/2018/0514
APP/2018/0548
APP/2018/2911