



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 September 2015

by David Spencer BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 14 September 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/U2615/W/15/3018503

Land Off Meadow Way, Rollesby, Great Yarmouth, Norfolk

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Badger Building (E.Anglia) Ltd against the decision of Great Yarmouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 06/14/0381/O, dated 3 June 2014, was refused by notice dated 5 December 2014.
 - The development proposed is residential development 35 dwellings, including access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application was submitted in outline with all matters reserved except for highway access. Nevertheless it was accompanied by supporting information including, amongst other things, a flood risk assessment and a transport statement including survey work.
3. The appellant in their final comments on the appeal have requested that the description of the development is amended to read "up to 30 dwellings". The proposal is in outline and whilst an indicative layout plan was submitted the appellant has also requested that this be disregarded. Irrespective of the indicative layout plan it nonetheless remains that matters of layout and design would be reserved for separate approval and as such I see no reason why it should not be set aside. Notwithstanding the technical evidence from the appellant and the submissions of the Local Highway Authority, I am satisfied from reading the evidence that the substantive issues in this appeal remain irrespective of whether the appeal site yields up to 30 dwellings or the originally submitted 35 dwellings. As such, I consider no one would be prejudiced were I to consider the appeal proposal on the basis of an outline proposal for up to 30 dwellings.
4. The appellant has submitted a planning obligation under the provisions of Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 in the form of a Unilateral Undertaking (UU). The proposed contributions in the UU would need to be assessed against the statutory tests set out in the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010.
5. I undertook an accompanied site visit at the appeal site with representatives from the appellant and the Local Planning Authority. In addition, I also undertook, on an unaccompanied basis on the same date, a site visit of the

local highway conditions in Rollesby during the AM peak period (07:45-09:00) to assess amongst other things, traffic movements associated with the primary school.

Background and Main Issues

6. The appeal proposal has stimulated a notable number of local objections, including amongst other things, highway safety concerns, surface water flooding and absence of facilities in Rollesby to sustainably support the scale of development proposed.
7. The appellant has drawn my attention to the Council's decision-making process. The report to the Development Control Committee recommended refusal on the grounds of detriment to highway safety and lack of justification to approve a development outside of the village development limits with an emphasis on an outline scheme not being deliverable within the 2 year timeframe set out in the Council's interim housing policy. The minutes from the Development Control Committee meeting on 15 October 2014 resolve that the application be refused in line with the recommendation on the grounds of highway safety and surface water flooding and drainage. From the evidence before me, it is clear that highway safety is a main issue for this appeal.
8. The officer report that did not recommend refusal based on the Environment Agency's (EA) position and the Committee minutes appear to recommend refusal based on local submissions of flooding events. However, the reason for refusal inserts the EA's holding objection on the methodology of the appellant's Flood Risk Assessment. Nonetheless, despite this lack of continuity and what appears to be an unresolved objection from the EA, I consider, given the evidence before me, that flood risk is a main issue for this appeal.
9. The Council's development plan consists of those saved policies of the Great Yarmouth Borough-Wide Local Plan adopted in 2001. The Council is progressing towards a new Local Plan and has produced an Interim Housing Land Supply Policy (IHLSP) which was adopted in July 2014 in response to the National Planning Policy Framework's (NPPF) requirement to proactively manage a deliverable supply of housing sites. The IHLSP is not formally part of the development plan but it is a material consideration.
10. The IHLSP applies when the Council's five year housing land supply utilises sites identified in the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). The appeal site is identified in the SHLAA as deliverable. The IHLSP sets out 14 criteria where new development outside, but adjacent to existing village development limits, may be deemed acceptable. The Council's report recommendation, committee decision and decision notice do not specify which IHLSP criteria the appeal proposal would transgress. In my view, it is clear that the Council's decision relates to IHLSP criterion (j) highway safety and criterion (n) deliverability. Having read carefully, the Council's Committee report, the officer recommendation and the Committee minutes, the reference in the decision notice that the appeal site is not in a sustainable location (principally criterion (a) of the IHLSP) is not a conclusion that readily flows through the decision-making process described above. As such I share the appellant's concerns in this regard. However, a scale of development on the appeal site, even when reduced to up to 30 dwellings, would be significant in the context of a village such as Rollesby. Many local residents have raised the

sustainability of the location and as such I consider it a main issue for this appeal in the context of the Council's IHLSP.

11. Therefore, the main issues in this appeal are as follows:

- (1) The effect of the proposed access on highway safety, with particular reference to visibility at the junction of King Georges Avenue and the A149 Main Road;
- (2) Whether the proposed development would be at risk of flooding, or would increase flood risk elsewhere; and
- (3) Whether the proposed scale of development would be in a sustainable location.

Reasons

Highway Safety

12. The appeal site would be accessed from Meadow Way, an estate road which would allow for two way traffic to pass and has footways. From Meadow Way there are two routes connecting to the A149 Main Road. The most direct route would be via King Georges Avenue with the alternative route via Low Road and Court Road. The appellant submits that the King Georges Avenue junction was laid out to account for the future development of the appeal site, which was granted planning permission in the 1960s. Be that as it may, both highway standards and traffic volumes have changed in the intervening 50 years which requires me to examine highway safety in the current circumstances.
13. In terms of likely direction of vehicle movements I have little to persuade me other than the majority of vehicle movements from the appeal site would be seeking to travel easterly on the A149 given this is the direction towards Great Yarmouth as the nearest main town for services and employment.
14. In this respect the route via Low Road and Court Road would provide a marginally shorter route which would be desirable to some vehicle users. I note that there are no on-street parking restrictions on this route but that most dwellings benefit from off-street parking. I also found the overall alignment and width of this route to be not so constrained as to deter its use. Whilst my site visit can only provide a snapshot there was very little on-street parking at the AM peak and overall volumes of traffic on this route were low. There are footways and intermittent street lighting along this route, and those limited section sections without footway coincide where the alignment of the road provides good visibility with driveway entrances to provide stepping off points. Furthermore, I have little evidence that the junction of Court Road with the A149 is substandard or has a poor accident record. In my view I found this route to be a safe and convenient means of accessing the A149 from the appeal site. As such I find the appellant's submission, underpinned in part by traffic count data¹, that an appreciable proportion of traffic generated by the appeal proposal would access the A149 via this route to be a reasonable one.
15. However, traffic generated by the appeal proposal would utilise the King Georges Avenue junction onto the A149. A proportion of these vehicles would

¹ Traffic count undertaken 17 September 2014

be turning left towards North Walsham² and as such visibility in the north-west direction would not be critical to highway safety. This leaves a residual number of vehicle movements that would turn right at this junction towards Great Yarmouth. The evidence of the appellant and the Local Highway Authority (LHA) on the overall number of vehicle movements generated by the appeal proposal is now broadly comparable³ assuming each dwelling would generate some 5-6 vehicle movements a day. Taking the upper end of this range would equate to some 210 vehicle movements per day and assuming a reasonable proportion would use Court Road and an element would turn left at the King Georges Avenue, the remaining balance of vehicle movements over the hours of an average weekday would not result in a significant intensification of vehicle movements using the King Georges Avenue junction. Nonetheless, even a modest increase in movements at a severely substandard junction would be detrimental to highway safety.

16. There are some differences on the measured visibility distances at the King Georges Avenue junction in the non-traffic north-west direction, as well as traffic speeds on the A149. The King Georges Avenue junction is within a reasonable length of the A149 which is set at a 30mph speed limit. The speed limit changes from 40mph down to 30mph a short distance to the north-west of the junction and this is reinforced by an activated illuminated sign and large symbol painted on the highway. From the evidence before me the A149 was previously 40mph at the point of this junction and this is reflected in the age of the LHA speed data. Given the change in circumstances I have some doubts about relying on the LHA's speed data from 2008.
17. The LHA has undertaken recent observations and comment that vehicle speeds habitually exceed the speed limit at the 85th percentile and are likely to be closer to 40mph. My observations on site would generally accord with those of the LHA in that speed limit appears to be regularly exceeded. In arriving at this view, I note the alignment and character of the A149 through this part of Rollesby is a long sweeping curve with good forward visibility and wide carriageway width. It is not, as the appellant submits, a 'street character' and the handful of junctions and private entrances and the location of the primary school onto this road do not interrupt or change how this road functions as an A class road.
18. However, I cannot be certain by observation alone that the speeds are closer to 40mph. Recent survey work by the appellant reveals that 85th percentile speeds are in the region of 35mph at this location. The appellant further submits that these speeds should be subject to a correction factor to allow for wet weather conditions, which would result in an 85th percentile speed of 32mph. I consider this evidenced approach better reflects current conditions at the junction and as a result I consider 32mph a reasonable basis on which to assess the standard of visibility.
19. The visibility in the non-traffic (north-west) direction at the King Georges Avenue is estimated at 48metres at a 2.4 metre setback by the LHA and 55metres by the appellant. The LHA submits that it is their preference to use Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DRMB) standards rather than Manual for

² Appellant manual count of 17 September 2014 shows >50% of movements at this junction between 07:30 and 09:30 in this direction

³ Section 2 - Trip Generation, Rossi Long Consulting Note dated 23 September 2014 and Paragraph 5.1, LHA Highways Statement, July 2015

Streets (MfS) on main roads that carry notable volumes of traffic⁴. Both scenarios are below the standards in DMRB at the 30mph and 40mph speeds. However, the appellant contends that at 32mph a visibility of 47metres would accord with the requirement of the LHA's 'Safe Sustainable Development' document 2012⁵. Accordingly, and assuming a best case scenario of 30mph, at 48 metres the visibility in the north west direction would be only 53% of DMRB. The appellant submits a visibility of 55 metres at 32mph results in a visibility of 75% of DMRB and 100% of MfS⁶.

20. In my view, having considered the evidence, I see no reason given the function and character of the A149 why DMRB standards are not applicable. Accordingly, based on the evidence before me, even using the appellant's measurements, the north-west visibility at the junction is substandard against DMRB. The question is therefore, the degree of severity. In this regard I have been directed to a recent appeal decision in the County⁷. Whilst I have few details about this appeal the Inspector notes at paragraph 7 that about 55% of MfS1 visibility standard would be achieved. The decision goes on to say that Manual for Streets2 (MfS2) states that unless there is local evidence to the contrary, a reduction in visibility below recommended levels will not necessarily lead to a significant problem. This approach for MfS2 is based on research⁸, a copy of which was submitted by the appellant. Accordingly, having considered the character of the appeal site and local accident data the Inspector in that decision concluded that there would not be a severe impact on highway safety. Whilst I take the submission of the LHA that each case must be assessed on its merits, there is nonetheless a wider point that local circumstances may allow for some flexibility below standards provided the outcome would not be severely substandard.
21. In terms of specific circumstances, local residents have referred to accidents on the A149 in Rollesby including a fatality and several major accidents outside the school. I have very few details of these incidents and published accident data⁹ on the A149 in the vicinity of the King Georges Avenue in the past 5 years shows only 2 'slight' accidents, neither of which were at King Georges Avenue junction. The LHA submit that it is by good fortune rather than justification that existing arrangements are satisfactory that there are not more personal injury records at this location and the intensified use of this junction would be likely to result in accidents. I find it difficult to share this view based on the lack of accident evidence and the fact that this is a long established junction. Regular users of the junction, particularly those accessing and egressing King Georges Avenue will be familiar with its layout and characteristics and will drive accordingly. For these reasons, I share the submission of the appellants that there are no inherent problems with highway safety at the A149 / King Georges Avenue junction.
22. I observed that there are lowered kerbs with tactile paving where the footway along the A149 crosses the Kings Georges Avenue and a similar arrangement immediately to the east on the A149 to provide a pedestrian connection to the

⁴ Traffic surveys on the A149 undertaken in 2007 near King Georges Avenue recorded 8800 vehicle movements a day.

⁵ Paragraphs 5.9-5.10

⁶ Final Comments from Rossi Long Consulting 4 August 2015

⁷ APP/L2630/A/14/2226538

⁸ Research for MfS2 High Risk Collision Sites and Y Distance Visibility September 2010

⁹ Appendix B to Rossi Long Consulting Statement 23 September 2014; Appendoix A LHA Appeal Statement July 2015

playing field. These crossing points are positioned where there are clear parking restrictions on the highway around the entrance to King Georges Avenue. As such there is no restriction to visibility caused by parked vehicles and consequently users of these crossings and vehicles at the King Georges Avenue junction would be well aware of one another. I have no persuasive evidence that these crossing arrangements are presently unsafe or that an intensified use of the junction would severely harm users of these crossings.

23. It has also been put to me that vehicles park on King Georges Avenue during the school drop off and collection times. I saw very little evidence of this and do not consider that school related traffic makes the junction or highway conditions on King Georges Avenue unsafe. I note the Parish Council submissions that they have allowed parking for the school to take place at the recreation ground, which I observed, and without it vehicles would park on the A149. I have very little evidence that the Parish Council intends to stop the use of the recreation ground car park, which has a dedicated path and gate to the primary school. Nor do I have any evidence that were parking for the school to return to on-street parking on the A149 that this would make the King Georges Avenue junction unsafe given that parking restrictions apply around this junction.
24. I therefore conclude that the effect of the proposed access on highway safety, with particular reference to visibility at the junction of King Georges Avenue and the A149 Main Road would not be severely detrimental. Accordingly, the objective of Policy TCM13 of the Great Yarmouth Borough-Wide Local Plan 2001 to resist development were it would endanger highway safety would not be compromised. Whilst the visibility of the junction in the non-traffic north west direction is below the standards in DRMB it is no so substandard that appeal proposal should be prevented on transport grounds because the residual cumulative effects are severe, as set out in the NPPF at paragraph 32.

Flood Risk

25. The appeal site is located in flood zone 1 on the Environment Agency (EA) mapping which is defined as having a "low probability" of flooding. The site slopes gently from north to south towards properties and the highway on Low Road to the south. Local residents and the Parish Council refer to flooding on Low Road, including as recently as 2014, which is reflected in the EA comments on the planning application. However, I have very little evidence, including any evidence from the Local Lead Flood Authority, of the severity or extent of these events or that run-off from the appeal site is a contributory element. I note that there are ditches along Low Road and the appellant submits that maintenance regimes for these ditches could be a plausible contributory factor. Consequently, I am uncertain that there is a significant surface water flooding problem in the locality and, if there is a flooding issue on Low Road, that the appeal site is part of that problem and that the appeal proposal would exacerbate the issue.
26. The requirement¹⁰ for the appeal site is that foul and surface water is managed in such a way so as to not increase the risk of flooding on the site or elsewhere. The appellant has submitted a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) which includes permeable surfaces for infiltration and an approach and calculations which reflect guidance in CIRIA 582 and CIRIA 635. The scheme would also

¹⁰ NPPF paragraph 103 & Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph 001 Reference ID: 7-001-20140306

- include an infiltration basin at a low point of the site for highway surface run-off. The appellant submits that this approach is technically viable due to underlying geological conditions (primarily sand and gravel and occasional clay horizons) based on local borehole data.
27. The EA submits that the FRA is inadequate in that borehole data is taken a short distance from the site and that EA geology data shows the site as part sandy, part clay. The EA has sought additional test pit trialling at the appeal site. The EA geology data is not before me and consequently I have little reason to conclude other than there will be appreciable areas of the site where the geological conditions will allow for infiltration. Additionally, the appellant has submitted that a six inch highway drain along Meadow Way has spare capacity to take the highway surface water and this could be controlled by condition.
28. The EA also objects that it has not been demonstrated that the attenuation basin for the road drainage can be accommodated on the appeal site. The appeal proposal is in outline with matters of layout to be determined separately. The appellant's FRA shows on page 14 an indicative layout with an infiltration basin within the site. Whilst the appellant no longer wishes this indicative layout to be considered, the appellant also wishes to reduce the scheme from 35 to a maximum of 30 dwellings. This lower density would provide increased scope and flexibility for the appropriate position of an infiltration basin within the site.
29. From the evidence before me the EA has not submitted any additional evidence as part of the appeal process. Based on the evidence¹¹ submitted by the appellant I am satisfied that a proportionate level of detail¹² has been provided to demonstrate that there is a reasonable prospect that the appeal site can achieve appropriate infiltration rates, particularly as the appellant's proposal to reduce the capacity of the site to up to 30 dwellings will inevitably result in more undeveloped and permeable surface area at the appeal site. Additionally, I see no substantive or evidenced reason why a combination of on-site attenuation through the proposed SUDS mechanism together with available capacity in the highway drainage network would ensure that surface water discharge from the site would be maintained at no more than the current greenfield run-off rate. The appellant has also submitted evidence of extensive pre-commencement conditions that have been accepted by the EA on another development site in the County and again I see no reason why a similar conditional approach would not be appropriate at the appeal site.
30. A local resident has referred to potential pollution of the Broads water network. I have very little evidence to substantiate that there is any risk of this scenario. The appellant's Flood Risk Assessment states that groundwater is over 3 metres beneath the surface of the site and I have no evidence that foul or surface water from the site would readily enter local watercourses in an untreated or un-attenuated form.
31. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not be at risk of flooding, nor would it increase flood risk elsewhere. Accordingly, the appeal proposal would be consistent with the objectives of the NPPF at paragraph 17

¹¹ Flood Risk Assessment April 2014, Evans Rivers and Coastal Ltd response to EA dated 29 August 2014 and Appellant final comments August 2015

¹² Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph 031 Reference ID: 7-031-20140306

for development to take full account of flood risk and at paragraph 103 to ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere.

Sustainable Location

32. The appeal site is adjacent to but outside of the village development limit for Rollesby as shown on the proposals map for the 2001 Borough-wide Local Plan. The Council submits that Local Plan Policy HOU10 applies in that the proposed dwellings would be in the countryside where particular justification is required. I accept that Policy HOU10 would accord with paragraph 55 of the NPPF in terms of the need to avoid isolated new housing in the countryside. However, the appeal location is not isolated and paragraph 55 of the NPPF addresses rural housing more broadly by stating it should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural settlements.
33. Rollesby is identified in the Council's IHLSP as a secondary village with few services and facilities, with limited access to public transport and very few employment opportunities. Nonetheless, Policy CS2 of the emerging Core Strategy seeks to distribute 5% of development in the Borough to secondary villages. I have few details about the emerging Core Strategy and I am therefore cautious about ascribing significant weight to this nascent document. However, the Local Plan is of some age and pre-dates the NPPF by some margin. Whilst neither party has categorically submitted that there is not a five year supply of deliverable housing sites in the Borough I note in the introductory section of the IHLSP that the document is a response to the NPPF requirement that the delivery of housing sites needs to be actively managed and that the IHLSP will only be used when the Council's five year housing land supply includes sites identified in the SHLAA.
34. The Council's decision making process has applied the IHLSP and I can only conclude on that basis that there is not a deliverable five year housing land supply in the Borough without the need to draw on unallocated and unpermitted sites identified as deliverable in the SHLAA. The IHLSP also identifies at paragraphs 2.7-2.9 and Appendix 1, the issue of managing housing land supply in the context of an aging Local Plan and states that the IHLSP relates primarily to sites outside but adjacent to existing village development limits and urban areas.
35. In the context of the NPPF requirement to significantly boost the supply of housing¹³ through deliverable sites in sustainable locations there should not be a moratorium, through the application of, amongst other things, Local Plan Policy HOU10, on housing development outside the village development limits in settlements such as Rollesby where development would not be isolated and would be subject to the criteria in the Council's IHLSP. To a degree this is recognised at paragraph 6.5 of the committee report which states that the principle of residential development at the appeal location may be acceptable.
36. The Council submits that the IHLSP does not supersede the Local Plan and has drawn my attention to an earlier appeal decision¹⁴. I note that this appeal decision was for a single dwelling at an edge of village location where other Local Plan policies applied and the then draft IHLSP was not before the

¹³ NPPF, paragraph 47

¹⁴ APP/U2615/A/14/2212095

Inspector¹⁵. Both parties have submitted a more recent appeal decision¹⁶ in the Borough which found that Policy HOU10 had limited applicability in the context of the adopted IHLSP for sites adjoining the settlement boundary of secondary villages. Accordingly, given that the appeal site would not be isolated and the need for a supply of deliverable housing sites the IHLSP has been invoked, and I do not consider that Policy HOU10 should be given significant weight in this decision.

37. In terms of the applicability of the IHLSP, the appellant has submitted extracts from the 2014 update to the SHLAA which shows that the appeal site is available and achievable on the basis of 30 dwellings. It is one of three deliverable or developable sites in Rollesby identified in the SHLAA. However, SHLAAs are, as their name suggests, a strategic assessment of availability of housing land primarily to inform strategic planning processes and are not necessarily an indication that planning permission will be granted. However, as a deliverable SHLAA site it falls under the ambit of being considered against the criteria of the IHLSP.
38. The IHLSP states that new housing development may be deemed acceptable outside, but adjacent to existing village development, limits providing relevant criteria have been met. As concluded above the proposed development would create and utilise a safe access and as such criterion (j) of the IHLSP would be satisfied. From the evidence before me the remaining criteria of chief concern to the local community and the Local Planning Authority would appear to be scale (criterion (a)) and deliverability (criterion (n)).
39. Turning to deliverability, I have very little evidence to persuade me that the greenfield scheme would not be viable. The UU submitted by the appellant would provide for 20% affordable housing in accordance with IHLSP and other policy requirements and an open space contribution. The IHLSP states that development should commence within 2 years of planning permission being granted. The NPPF refers to deliverability as schemes that will be implemented within 5 years¹⁷. Whilst the proposal is in outline, I see no reason why reserved matters could not be determined within a relatively short period given the absence of constraints on this greenfield site and accordingly development commence within a 2 year timeframe. Furthermore, the appellant is a housebuilder which should provide additional confidence that the appeal proposal is not speculative proposal that will sit in abeyance and that overall a scheme of up to 30 dwellings would be deliverable on the site within the 5 years envisaged by the NPPF. Accordingly, I am not persuaded that because the proposal is in outline that criterion (n) of the IHLSP is offended.
40. On matters of scale, I have noted that the Local Planning Authority has recently resolved to grant planning permission for 10 dwellings on the southern part of the appeal site. So, to some extent this appeal decision is whether an additional maximum of 20 dwellings would be appropriate in Rollesby. The village is modestly sized but nonetheless benefits from a primary school, a recreation ground and pavilion, a village hall, bus stops with a reasonably regular daily service to Great Yarmouth and North Walsham, a hotel with bar, a café/restaurant and two hairdressers. These services, together with the business units on Martham Road, would provide some employment

¹⁵ Paragraph 9

¹⁶ APP/U2615/

¹⁷ Paragraph 47, footnote 11

opportunities. These facilities and services are all within reasonable walking distance of the appeal site along footways which are of good width and mostly with street lighting. I accept that there is a reasonable prospect that occupiers of the appeal proposal would walk to these facilities. Further services such as shop and post office are available in nearby Martham which is a short distance to the north by a minor road generally without footway or street lights.

41. The absence of some key day-to-day services and facilities in Rollesby means there is likely to be some reliance on the private car and as such the village is reasonably identified as secondary village in the emerging Core Strategy. Such categorisation does not inhibit additional residential development in Rollesby but the scale of housing would need to proportionate if it is to be sustainable in the terms defined in the NPPF¹⁸. At present I can only attach minimal weight to that approach in the Core Strategy of 5% of development to communities such as Rollesby given that such policies remain the subject of unresolved objections¹⁹. However, I do not find the tenet of the approach to be an unreasonable one in the context that most housing should be located where there is good access to day-to-day services and facilities.
42. I acknowledge that the NPPF at paragraph 55 allows for housing where it would maintain the vitality of rural communities and housing may be allowed in smaller settlements where it supports the services in a village nearby. In my view, the level of services in Rollesby provides a basis for some additional small-scale housing but given it is a modestly sized settlement without a shop or post office or sizeable employment opportunities there has to be an appropriate limit as to what constitutes small-scale. The SHLAA reflects this situation and states that it "partly constrains the suitability of the site". Whilst I accept that up to 30 dwellings, which would be the case if the site is to be used efficiently, would not harmfully erode the character at this edge of Rollesby due to adjoining residential development and reasonable boundary planting to the west, the proposed scale would represent a scale of development that would not be commensurate with Rollesby's size or role as a small village with limited services and facilities.
43. I therefore conclude that the scale of the appeal proposal would be contrary to criterion (a) of the IHLSP. Accordingly, the scale of additional housing development would result in future occupiers needing to travel for some day-to-day services. Whilst I have accepted this can be done in safe manner, the scale of residents at the appeal proposal and associated vehicle movements would unacceptably compromise the social and environmental dimensions of sustainability which require housing to be primarily delivered where there are accessible local services and to reduce the overall need to travel and as such use natural resources prudently. Consequently, the proposed scale of development would not be appropriate for the sustainability of the location.
44. I have considered carefully whether the benefit of additional housing to meet housing needs, together with 20% of that housing being affordable, in a location that is safe in highway terms and where flood risk can be appropriately managed, outweighs the harm identified from the scale of development at this rural location. In my view it does not, given that a smaller scale of development at the appeal location, akin to that already approved on part of the appeal site, would secure similar benefits in respect of housing needs but at

¹⁸ Paragraphs 6-9

¹⁹ Paragraph 5.3, Committee Report

a scale that would accord with the IHLSP. Consequently, the harm arising from the scale of the appeal proposal at a rural location where there is not a complete range of day-to-day facilities is overriding and on this basis alone the appeal should not succeed.

Other Matters

45. The appellant has submitted a signed and dated UU which would make a financial contribution towards the provision of public open space. However, because I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons it is not necessary for me to consider its provisions further.

Conclusion

46. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Spencer

INSPECTOR.

Richborough Estates