

## PLANNING APPLICATION - LAND AT WOODSIDE FARM, THE COMMON, CRICH

Ref: AVA/2017/1363

**Proposal:** Development of 58 dwellings (houses, bungalows & 30% affordable housing), infrastructure, public open space, equipped area for play, landscaping, ecological enhancement and stabling. The proposal may affect the setting of a listed building. The proposal is not in accordance with the provisions of the Development Plan.

**Location:** Land At Woodside Farm The Common Crich Matlock Derbyshire

**Response:** Crich Parish Council **STRONGLY OBJECTS** to the current revised proposals for green field residential development of 58 units in open countryside at Woodside, Crich.

When under the control of the previous administration AVBC were mindful to grant planning permission for greenfield development at Woodside. This was based on:

- a strategic allocation - which no longer exists following withdrawal of the emerging Local Plan, and
- an inability of AVBC to demonstrate a five-year housing supply - which it now can.

The Full Amber Valley Borough Council has resolved to review the previous decision.

The Crich Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan, adopted in 2018, makes provision for limited housing development to meet local needs as they arise during the remaining 12 years of the plan period to 2031. Local needs are fully catered for at present. In Crich, in addition to much development recently completed and underway, green field planning permissions exist for more than 100 dwellings (including approximately 40 affordable homes) the building of which has not even commenced. There can be no case to release further green fields for development in Crich Parish at this time. There is no public benefit to outweigh the considerable harm the proposals will cause.

Contrary to paragraph 40 of the NPPF the proposals are put forward by the applicants without any community engagement. Like the five previous schemes they have put forward for the green fields in question, the applicants show complete disregard for planning policy and community wishes.

As the applicants manoeuvre from one scheme to another, contradicting what they have said before, it is evident they are unwilling to comply with the requirements of the Statutory Development Plan. The NPPF is very clear that where a planning application conflicts with an up to date neighbourhood plan that forms part of the development plan, permission should not normally be granted.

The Housing and Planning Act (2016) requires **any conflict** with a neighbourhood plan to be set out in the committee/planning board report, that will inform any planning decision, where that report recommends granting planning permission for development that conflicts with an up to date neighbourhood plan. The proposals are in conflict with Policies NP1, NP2, NP3, NP4, NP5, NP9 and NP11 of the Neighbourhood Plan. These conflicts must be properly identified and considered.

## Conflicts with the Crich Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan.

1. The proposal for an estate of 58 dwellings on green fields is in direct conflict with Policy NP1 which seeks development of individual dwellings or small groups of dwellings on small infill sites. (Paragraph 92 of the Neighbourhood Plan follows the national definition of less than 10 dwellings in this respect). This is a key requirement of the local community that surfaced through the extensive consultation during the Neighbourhood Plan preparation process. Paragraph 29 of the NPPF clearly states “*Neighbourhood planning gives communities the power to develop a shared vision for their area.*”
2. The proposals are in conflict with Policy NP1 and Policy NP2 in that they make no attempt to demonstrate they will meet local housing development needs within Crich.
3. With a considerable supply of dwellings with planning permission but where development has not commenced the requirement of Policy NP2 relating to benefit outweighing harm is not met.
4. The proposals fail to demonstrate the proposed housing mix responds to local needs in conflict with Policy NP5.
5. The proposals are in conflict with Policy NP4 in that they do not conserve or enhance the landscape character and setting of Crich. The proposals are in conflict with Policy NP2 and Policy NP3 in that the proposed intrusions into open countryside are in areas of valued landscape (Paragraph 170 NPPF), defined as important Green Gaps, and extend to the lower slopes to the west.
6. The proposals are in conflict with Policy NP2 as they will result in development, including an extensive attenuation basin on land immediately west and south of Woodbank House and to the rear of 144 to 148 The Common, in open countryside which the Policy states, must be protected for the sake of its intrinsic character and beauty. The proposed drainage attenuation basin in this area will significantly alter the appearance of this agricultural land to the detriment of visual amenity in an area of landscape sensitivity. The proposed attenuation basin will also introduce an unnatural built feature in the important open break between Crich and Fritchley which maintains their separate identities and settings, in conflict with Policy NP3.
7. The proposals are in conflict with Policy NP2 in that they propose an extensive paddock with stable and tack room on a green field in the western part of the site. This proposal and subsequent related change (including jumps, horseboxes, waste matter, and other equipment) will significantly alter the appearance of this agricultural land in open countryside to the detriment of visual amenity in an area of landscape sensitivity. The Neighbourhood Plan identifies the slopes in question, rising to an SSSI and within a designated Green Gap, as having particular landscape and visual significance. This detrimental aspect of the proposals is not justified in the submission documents and could be seen as an attempt by the applicants to have the green field area in question regarded as brownfield previously developed land with potential future development implications.
8. The proposals are in conflict with Policy NP2 and Policy NP4 with respect to design principles. The proposals include areas of development where the density is inappropriate and not related to the surrounding environment. The requirement to draw on local character and enhance the distinctiveness of the parish is not met. (also see National Design Guide 2019)
9. The proposals are in conflict with Policy NP4 in that the southern boundary of the site layout is formed of private drives and road ends resulting in an unsatisfactory transition between the built development and the adjoining countryside. This proposed arrangement will seriously adversely affect the sensitive significant view corridor number 14 protected by Policy NP3.

10. The proposals are in conflict with Policy NP4 in that the design of individual properties and their proposed layout do not reflect the character of local traditional development.
11. The proposals are in conflict with Policy NP2 and Policy NP9 as avoidance of harm to important habitat is not demonstrated.
12. The proposals are in conflict with Policy NP2 and Policy NP11 as the scale of harm to heritage assets arising from the proposed development is inappropriate, particularly given the significance of Woodbank House and the former Clay Cross Company mineral railway heritage asset.

07/10/2019