

Parish: Kirkby
Ward: Stokesley
5

Committee date: 31 May 2018
Officer dealing: Mr K. Ayrton
Target date: 27 July 2018

17/02687/OUT

**Outline application (some matters reserved) for the construction of a mixed use B1, B2/B8 development and associated access
At Land South of Bridge House, Station Road, Stokesley
For Mr David Quigley**

This application is referred to Planning Committee as the proposal is a departure from the Development Plan

1.0 SITE, CONTEXT AND PROPOSAL

- 1.1 The application site is approximately 2.8 hectares in size, being square in shape, with the eastern boundary adjoining Station Road, which links Stokesley, to the north, and Kirkby in Cleveland, to the south. The supporting statement confirms that the land is currently in use as paddocks, used in association with an equestrian centre. The boundary of the application site does not follow the existing field boundary, being set within the field, with parts of the paddock being retained to the north, west and south.
- 1.2 Located a short distance to the north of the site is Eller Beck, which runs west to the east. To the west is the wider, generally flat countryside, with medium to long distance views available from within the site. These views wrap around to the south with longer distance views of the hills signalling the edge of the North York Moors National Park.
- 1.3 Nearby uses include a residential property to the south, which is in the ownership of the applicant, and a detached dwelling to the north, which adjoins the site. A further dwelling is located on the opposite site, amongst business premises which cover a large area of land that is physically detached from the main built up area of Stokesley, the centre of which is located approximately 1km to the north.
- 1.4 Further to the south of the site is a large nursery, comprising greenhouses. Much of this is screened by a mature hedge along the roadside, which also screens much of the application site.
- 1.5 There are connections to the town centre along Station Road, which passes Stokesley School. However, there is not a footway over this entire length. Stokesley Business Park also has an access to the B1257 to the north, which allows access to the wider road network whilst avoiding the town centre.
- 1.6 A public footpath passes close to the south western boundary of the application site. This links Station Road with the centre of Stokesley, passing over the A172.
- 1.7 Part of the north western extent of the site falls within Flood Zones 2 and 3. The remainder of the site falls within Flood Zone 1.
- 1.8 The current application is in outline form for business use. The submission identifies a mix of business uses comprising the following planning use classes:
 - **B1 (Businesses):** Offices (other than those that fall within A2), research and development of products and processes and light industry;

- **B2 (General Industry):** Use for industrial process other than one falling within class B1 (excluding incineration purposes, chemical treatment or landfill or hazardous waste); and
- **B8 (Storage and Distribution):** This class includes open air storage.

1.9 The only matter for approval at this stage is access. The remaining matters, i.e. appearance, landscaping, layout and scale would be for a later application if this is approved. Therefore the amount and mix of uses has not been specified at this stage.

1.10 An indicative site layout plan, elevations and street scene have been submitted in support of the application. Additional supporting documents include a Transport Assessment, Travel Plan, and Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy.

1.11 The site would be accessed off a new roundabout sited on Station Road, opposite the existing Ellerbeck Way access to Stokesley Business Park.

2.0 RELEVANT PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

2.1 The site does not have a planning history.

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

3.1 The relevant policies are:

CP1 – Sustainable Development

CP2 - Access

CP4 – Settlement Hierarchy

CP10 – The Scale of New Employment Development

CP10a – The Scale of New Employment by Sub-Area

CP11 – Distribution of New Employment Development

CP12 – Priorities for employment development

CP16 – Protecting and enhancing natural and man-made assets

CP17 – Promoting high quality design

CP18 – Prudent use of natural resources

CP21 – Safe response to natural and other forces

DP1 – Protecting amenity

DP3 – Site accessibility

DP8 – Development limits

DP9 – Development outside development limits

DP10 – Form and character of settlements

DP16 – Specific measures to assist the economy and employment

DP30 – Protecting the character and appearance of the countryside

DP31 – Protecting natural resources: biodiversity/nature conservation

DP32 – General design

DP33 - Landscaping

DP34 – Sustainable energy

DP43 – Flooding and floodplains

DP44 – Very noisy activities

National Planning Policy Framework

4.0 CONSULTATIONS

4.1 Kirby Parish Council – Objects for the following reasons:

- There are vacant units on the industrial park and allocated land also remains undeveloped, so it is unnecessary to give this greenfield site up to industrial use;

- Highway safety – it is inappropriate to introduce a roundabout onto a small undesignated road. There is no mention of Stokesley School in the traffic statement and the extra traffic generated would create a hazard;
 - The units are proposed far too close to private dwellings and would result in an immense loss of amenity to the immediate neighbour, Bridge House; and
 - The site is visible from the National Park. The bright colour proposed for the units is inappropriate. It is unclear how public amenity from the nearby footpath would be maintained.
- 4.2 Stokesley Town Council – Objects and supports the concerns raised by members of the public. The site does not appear in the LDF as an allocation of a preferred site in the emerging Local Plan. There are numerous vacant premises on the High Street and the Industrial Estate.
- 4.3 Highway Authority – No objection subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to secure (a) the provision of new cycleway/shared cycleway/footway infrastructure linking the site with the wider Stokesley network, including relevant signage; (b) Travel Plan monitoring; and (c) the provision of roundabout at the junction of Station Road and Ellerbeck Way.
- 4.4 The Authority has reviewed the documents submitted with the application and has taken the following matters into account in reaching its recommendation:
- The site layout is to be agreed at reserved matters. The submission indicates the site is to be accessed by a new four arm roundabout with Station Road and Ellerbeck Way. In principle the provision of a roundabout at this junction is acceptable;
 - The nearest existing bus stop to the site is located approximately 1000m away on Helmsley Road. The applicant has suggested that further infrastructure to improve access to the site by walking, cycling and public transport can be considered as part of the reserved matters submission;
 - The Transport Assessment demonstrates that the additional trips generated by the site will not have a severe impact on the surrounding highway network; and
 - The Authority will work with the developer to develop design measures that encourage walking, cycling and public transport as a means of accessing the site. A condition to enable such design measures is expected.
- 4.5 Northumbrian Water - The planning application does not provide sufficient detail with regard to the management of foul and surface water from the development, therefore a condition to secure these details is requested. A 6 inch AC (alternating current) main runs close to the site boundary and dependent of its exact location and depth may be affected by the development. Should this development proceed, the full cost of any necessary water main diversions will be the responsibility of the developer.
- 4.6 Environment Agency – Objects. The site partially lies within Flood Zones 2 and 3, the medium and high probability zones.

The proposed B1, B2 and B8 uses are considered to be “less vulnerable” land uses and it is therefore necessary for the application to pass the Sequential Test and to be supported by a site-specific flood risk assessment (FRA), which can demonstrate that the development will be safe for its lifetime, taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall.

The applicant has not submitted any Sequential Test evidence with this application. In accordance with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 103,

consideration should only be given to development in flood risk areas following application of the Sequential Test.

The FRA submitted with the application does not comply with the Planning Practice Guidance and therefore does not provide a suitable basis for assessment to be made of the flood risks arising from the proposed development. In the absence of an acceptable FRA the Agency recommends that permission is refused.

- 4.7 Ramblers Association – Objects. The development would destroy the countryside walk offered by the popular footpath immediately to the north, which has views of the open countryside. There are a number of brownfield sites for industrial development.
- 4.8 Campaign to Protect Rural England – Objects: the tilted balance set out in paragraph 14 of the NPPF has not been triggered. It is noted that there is no development on this side of the highway (Station Road). Does not agree that the policies in the development plan are out of date; weight should be given to those policies, which are consistent with the NPPF. The submission places too much focus on the economic pillar of sustainable development. It fails to give adequate consideration to the social and environmental pillars.
- 4.9 Public comments – 56 objections have been received making the following comments:
- Concern about building on greenfield land;
 - There is already a generous area available at the industrial park, which is better equipped to meet the needs of businesses (e.g. larger roads) and Armstrong Richardson also has permission to extend. Vacancy rates on Stokesley Industrial Estate are higher than expected, evidenced by the relatively large number of properties currently on the market, some of which have been vacant for a protracted period of time. There is no need to allocate more;
 - The site would need to be accessed along a country road with a poor surface;
 - The development would be visually intrusive, destroy what is left of the beautiful character of Stokesley and impact on the setting of the National Park;
 - The site is not in the Local Plan, is speculative and would bring no benefits to the area;
 - It is a step too far to start developing on the other side of the road;
 - The site is adjacent to a flood plain area. Additional surface run-off water being fed into our system can only heighten the chance of flooding in Station Road;
 - The development would also offer a direct route for even more traffic onto Station Road, and short of physically blocking access, car drivers will inevitably take the shortest route. Congestion and traffic would impact on the nearby school;
 - The carbon footprint of such an expansion would be massive and in light of government policy this would be notable;
 - Risk of pollution in the river at the bottom of the field;
 - Precedent for similar projects;
 - There is 4,500 acres of land allocated on Teesside following the closure of Redcar steelworks;
 - Amenity implications of increasing noise and traffic nuisance;
 - The existing Business Park area has an interesting variety of architecture (including old railway buildings and individually designed modern structures) and produces a feeling of interest and spaciousness. In contrast, the proposed development has a monotonous regularity and is apparently designed simply to accommodate as high a density of units as possible with no regard to the surroundings;
 - Devaluation of the area; negative impact on the surrounding area;

- The site is agricultural land and there is a no need to change the land use;
- The application is premature;
- The development would disrupt the natural boundary along Station Road and affect the character of the settlement;
- Impact on biodiversity of the site;
- Danger to recreational and commuting cyclists - Station Road is a long-standing and favoured route for cyclists accessing and exiting the town and the lower section of Station Road to Ellerbeck Way forms a loop from the proposed Endeavour Way;
- The assertion that Council policies are out-of-date is far too simplistic and inaccurate. Paragraph 211 of the NPPF states that "for the purposes of decision making, the policies should not be considered out of date simply because they were adopted prior to the publication of this Framework";
- The proposal does not comply with policy CP11, which itself quotes further a requirement to be compliant with a range of other additional policies it appears inappropriate to allocate further land in or around Stokesley through a departure application at the present time, simply because there is a projected need district wide for more employment land in the future, mainly on allocated sites and in alternative locations and in the case of the Stokesley sub area, not until existing allocations have been exhausted. These matters are presently being addressed as part of the new development plan based upon guidance within the emerging evidence base.
- The applicant's analysis does not provide compelling evidence that the Council has insufficient employment land and industrial space sufficient to allow a major departure application to be approved in the open countryside;
- The Council's recent assessment of land availability for new allocations outlined for Stokesley has been based upon a requirement of central government guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) to ensure that plan making is soundly based upon "a presumption in favour of sustainable development"; and
- In relation to flood risk and drainage, the application does not comprise sustainable development.

Three letters of support make the following comments:

- There is a shortage of suitable business premises in Stokesley; therefore we have had to take temporary premises in Darlington;
- The application would bring more jobs to local people and the opportunity to build purpose-built state of the art buildings;
- The area already hosts large offices and heavy industry; a further development of the scale proposed would not be detrimental to the landscape or character of the area; and
- The proposed alterations to the road layout would be beneficial to the whole area, reducing speed and congestion simultaneously.

5.0 OBSERVATIONS

- 5.1 The main issues to consider are: (i) the principle of the development in this location; (ii) the impact on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area; (iii) residential amenity; (iv) highway matters; (v) flood risk; and (vi) sustainable construction.

Principle

- 5.2 The site is located beyond the Development Limits for Stokesley, which follow the line of Station Road and includes Stokesley Business Park, including land allocated (SE1) for employment use to the east of the Business Park.
- 5.3 Policy CP4 states the development in other locations (i.e. beyond the Development Limits) will only be supported when an exceptional case can be made. These include where development: is necessary to meet the needs of farming, forestry, recreation, tourism, and other enterprises with an essential requirement to locate in the countryside; is necessary to secure a significant improvement to the environment of the conservation feature; would provide affordable housing; would re-use existing buildings and support a sustainable rural economy; would make provision for renewable energy generation; or it would support the social and economic regeneration of rural areas.
- 5.4 Policy DP8 sets out further reasoning for the Development Limits. These include the need to:
- Relate development opportunities to the scale and appropriate distribution of housing (and other developments) proposed to be met by the sustainable hierarchy of settlements;
 - To ensure that new development is sympathetic in scale and location to the form and character of settlements;
 - To protect the countryside; and
 - To prevent the outward spread of development from settlements.
- 5.5 These requirements are consistent with the core planning principles included in the NPPF.
- 5.6 Core Strategy Policy - CP12 states that support will be given to developing and sustaining the economy of Hambleton. This is expanded upon in policy DP16, which identifies economic priorities. These include (i) diversification in the range of economic activities, in particular encouraging employment opportunities in higher skilled jobs; (ii) measures assisting the further development of the main industrial clusters represented in the area: particularly food, digital, biomedical and steel/engineering; (iv) ensuring the continued renaissance of the five Service Centres; (v) and increasing manufacturing productivity generally, including through encouragement to the development of support services, and supporting existing businesses to grow to realise their potential; (vi) supporting skills development; (vii) providing support and facilities to encourage local new and young businesses, particularly in key growth sectors such as IT, e-businesses, digital media, and creative technology; (viii) provision of high quality sites and premises suitable for B1 uses, in town centre locations wherever possible; provision of mixed use sites, incorporating high quality layouts, landscaping and design, based on sustainable development principles; and (xiii) supporting transport investment which will help sustain the local economy, giving priority to schemes which improve links and improve local accessibility between homes and jobs across the District, and in particular improve accessibility to and from the main Service Centres, especially by sustainable forms of transport.
- 5.7 CP11 confirms that most employment development will be encouraged to locate within the development limits of the Service Centres. The only exceptions identified are small-scale developments to meet rural needs.

- 5.8 The local policy is consistent with the NPPF, which confirms that the Government is committed to ensuring the planning system does everything it can to support sustainable economic growth.
- 5.9 However, the employment policies cannot be viewed in isolation. They have to be read alongside the policies relating to the settlement hierarchy and development limits. These set out a clear approach to meeting current and future development requirements in a manner that restricts the impact on the environment. As required by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, section 38(6), the decision must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 5.10 Therefore, as a starting point, the principle of development cannot be supported as the site is located beyond the development limits and the exceptions to development outlined in CP4 have not been met.
- 5.11 However, the applicant has made reference to the emerging Local Plan, its supporting evidence base, and argues that the Local Development Framework (LDF) is out of date. They consider (correctly) that the emerging Local Plan can have limited weight in the determination of the application at present. Their rationale is that the preparation of a new local plan indicates that the current plan and its policies are out of date. This leads them to conclude that the Development Limits are not material to the determination of the application and no weight should be attributed to policy CP4.
- 5.12 In further support of their argument, the applicant makes reference to the emerging Local Plan's evidence base, specifically the Employment Land Review (September 2016) prepared by GL Hearn. Key points made in the applicant's submission include:
- Stokesley Business Park is classified as a Principal/Key Employment site within the review;
 - The employment site is not well served by public transport;
 - The wider site has a high occupancy rate and the area is one of the more sought after location in the district as demonstrated by a low vacancy rate; and
 - The Council should seek to retain and protect this area for b-class employment use. The 3.53Ha vacant sites should also be considered as part of the potential employment land supply as should the 5.3 ha employment allocation (8.8 ha in total) which should be retained. The site would represent opportunities for industrial (mainly at the northern parts), general office or/and wholesale employment uses.
- 5.13 The applicant does not consider that the findings in the Employment Land Review are based on an objectively assessed need. They do not consider that the assessment has robustly assessed need, having failed to consider unmet need from neighbouring local authorities.
- 5.14 In support of this view the applicant has submitted a letter from a local commercial agent, which states that they consider there would be demand for the proposed units. Whilst it is noted that the applicant has queried the robustness of the emerging evidence base for the new Local Plan, the alternative evidence that has been submitted by the applicant is very limited and can only be given very limited weight. Further, the agent has submitted no evidence to indicate that the current need cannot be met by the existing allocation to the east of the Stokesley Business Park or within the existing Business Park itself where potential for intensification has been identified.

- 5.15 It is also noted that the applicant's submission makes no reference to other parts of the Employment Land Review. Most notably it includes criteria for assessing the strategic potential of sites. These include proximity to the A1/A19 corridor and goes on to identify sites in Northallerton and Leeming Bar and at the Dalton Industrial Estate.
- 5.16 The above points lead to the conclusion that no exceptional case has been made to allow development of this scale beyond the development limits as required by policy CP4. The applicant has presented the case that the development plan is out of date making reference to paragraph 14 of the NPPF, which indicated that any adverse effects should significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. However, it is not accepted that the LDF is absent, silent or relevant policies out of date. There is clearly a development plan, the plan is not silent and the relevant policies are consistent with the NPPF and as such are not out of date.
- 5.17 Moreover, whilst the applicant has made several references to a shortage of employment land, insufficient evidence has been submitted to indicate that there is an absence of a supply of employment land, either within the District or the Stokesley sub-area. Therefore the tilted balance contained within the NPPF does not apply.
- 5.18 This somewhat negates the applicant's justification for the proposal. However it is important to also consider the impacts of the development, most notably on the impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside.

Character and appearance

- 5.19 The North Yorkshire and York Landscape Characterisation Project report (2011) was prepared to provide a consistent and integrated County-wide picture of the landscape in order to help raise awareness of local distinctiveness. The application site is located within the "Vale Farmland with Dispersed Settlements" character type, which extends to the north and west across the width of the District. Key characteristics include:
- Generally low lying, gently rolling, landscape which contains several small river corridors;
 - A distant sense of enclosure in views east and west provided by the backdrop of the North York Moors;
 - A medium to large-scale agricultural landscape which is delineated by a network of mature hedgerows, often containing hedgerow trees; and
 - A dispersed settlement pattern of farmsteads, small hamlets and villages.
- 5.20 The landscape is identified as having moderate sensitivity as a result of the combination of open views to adjacent Landscape Character Type and a sense of enclosure provided by pockets of deciduous woodland. It is also considered that there is a high landscape and cultural sensitivity overall as a result of the dispersed settlement pattern, pockets of historic parkland and predominantly rural character.
- 5.21 The application has not been supported by a landscape and visual impact assessment. It is evident from the scale of the development that there will be some landscape and visual impact. It was noted at the site visit that there are public rights of way to the west of the site, one of which passes through the south western corner of the site. The response from the Ramblers confirms that local rights of way are well used. Views of the site will also be available from the more distant North York Moors National Park.

- 5.22 Currently, Station Road provides a strong demarcation between the urban area of Stokesley, specifically the Stokesley Business Park, and the countryside. There are some dispersed pockets of development to the west of Station Road, including the nursery located further to the south. However, the character and appearance is closely associated with the wider landscape character, which is typical of the wider area being low lying, gently rolling, landscape which contains several small river corridors; with a distant sense of enclosure in views east and west provided by the backdrop of the North York Moors National Park.
- 5.23 The introduction of a large scale block of commercial development would have a significant adverse impact on the character of the site and its relationship with the wider countryside. These impacts would be particularly significant in localised views. The land retained around the site would be in awkward pockets not typical of the wider network of fields.
- 5.24 Currently from Station Road, the existence of the mature hedge and open countryside beyond create a sense of being close to the countryside along with a very clear visual distinction between the built up Business Park and the surrounding countryside. The proposal would result in part of the hedgerow being lost to create the access and associated visibility splays, resulting in views being made available of the proposed business park. This would result in a significant visual impact.
- 5.25 Due to the above concerns it is considered that the development would result in an urbanising and highly incongruous incursion into the open countryside, with a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the area. As such, the proposal would conflict with the countryside protection and design aims of policies CP16 and DP30 and paragraph 17 of the NPPF, which states that planning should recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

Residential amenity

- 5.26 There are several dwellings located in close proximity to the site. Most notably this includes Acacia Bungalow on the opposite side of Station Road, Bridge House to the north and Field House to the south, which is in the ownership of the applicant. There are additional residential properties in the wider vicinity, located along Station Road.
- 5.27 These residential properties are also located in close proximity to the Stokesley Business Park, so they already experience impact from the day to day activities associated with employment type uses.
- 5.28 Considering the existing use of the site, the proposed mix of employment uses and their associated activities and traffic generation, it is considered that the development would have some impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties. However, the outline nature of the proposal and the inclusion of uses such as B1, which can be accommodated close to residential development without giving rise to harm, provides scope for a suitable layout to be achieved at reserved matters stage if outline permission were granted.

Highways

- 5.29 The proposal includes the provision of a four arm roundabout with Station Road and Ellerbeck Way. The Highway Authority is satisfied with this principle. A new footpath is also proposed along the length of the site's frontage linking with the wider network of footpaths, including the one to the north, leading to the town centre.
- 5.30 Taking account of the Highway Authority's advice it is considered that the proposal would not have a severe impact on the surrounding highway network. The junctions

assessed in the supporting Transport Assessment could continue to operate within acceptable levels of capacity. It is recognised that the internal access arrangements would be subject to a future reserved matters application, should the outline application be approved.

Flood risk

- 5.31 The northern corner of the site is located within Flood Zones 2 and 3. The application has been accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment. Planning Practice Guidance states that:

A flood risk assessment is carried out by (or on behalf of) a developer to assess the flood risk to and from a development site. Where necessary, the assessment should accompany a planning application submitted to the local planning authority. The assessment should demonstrate to the decision-maker how flood risk will be managed now and over the development's lifetime, taking climate change into account, and with regard to the vulnerability of its users.

The objectives of a site-specific flood risk assessment are to establish:

- *Whether a proposed development is likely to be affected by current or future flooding from any source;*
- *Whether it will increase flood risk elsewhere;*
- *Whether the measures proposed to deal with these effects and risks are appropriate;*
- *The evidence for the local planning authority to apply (if necessary) the Sequential Test, and;*
- *Whether the development will be safe and pass the Exception Test, if applicable.'*

- 5.32 The Environment Agency has objected on the basis that the Flood Risk Assessment does not provide a suitable basis for assessment to be made of the flood risks arising from the proposed development.

- 5.33 The Agency has also objected on the basis that the application is not accompanied by a Sequential Test. This is in recognition of the NPPFs requirement that local planning authorities should only consider development appropriate in areas at risk of flooding where, informed by a site-specific flood risk assessment following the Sequential Test.

- 5.34 Therefore the proposed developed fails to accord with the Sequential Test in relation to development in areas at risk of flooding. The proposal conflicts with Core Strategy Policy CP21 which requires that proposals must ensure protection from flooding. It also conflicts with Development Policies Policy DP42, which is concerned with flooding and includes that development proposals advanced on land that has any risk of flooding will need to demonstrate that the sequential test has been undertaken and where required the exceptions test. The proposed development also fails to accord with the NPPF, amplified by the PPG, in relation to development in areas at risk of flooding.

- 5.35 Whilst this is included as a reason for refusal, it is acknowledged that only a small part of the application site is located within flood zones 2 and 3. Considering the outline nature of the application it is envisaged that the Environment Agency concerns could be overcome. However, this would be subject to further detailed assessment of flood risk.

Sustainable construction

- 5.36 During the consideration of the application, the applicant confirmed that it would be their intention to incorporate sustainable construction methods into the development in order to create a negative carbon footprint, in conjunction with a “parasitic heating/energy system”.
- 5.37 The applicant has identified that roof mounted equipment would allow solar thermal energy to be collected to serve the development. During times of high input, energy could also be exported to the grid or, using the “parasitic heating” concept, to nearby businesses.
- 5.38 It is recognised that weight can be given to development that incorporates more sustainable methods of construction and allow more efficient operation, as this can be seen as improving the overall sustainability of a development in the planning balance. However, considering the outline nature of the scheme, it is not possible to afford much weight to this point as the impacts are not quantifiable. Therefore whilst the intention is welcomed, it cannot outweigh the harm identified.

6.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 6.1 That subject to any outstanding consultations permission is **REFUSED** for the following reasons:
1. The proposed development would extend employment development outside the Development Limits of Stokesley. It is considered that no exceptional case for development beyond the Development Limits, as allowed for by Policy CP4, has been made. Development Policies for the supply of employment land area are up to date and consistent with the NPPF. Therefore the proposed development would be contrary to Local Development Framework Policies CP1, CP2, CP4, CP10, CP10A, CP11, DP8 and DP9.
 2. The development would result in an urbanising and highly incongruous incursion into the open countryside, with a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the area. As such, the proposal would conflict with the countryside protection and design aims of Policies CP16, DP30 and paragraph 17 of the NPPF, which states that planning should recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.
 3. The proposal is in an area of flood risk. The application has not been accompanied by a Sequential Test, and the Flood Risk Assessment does not provide a suitable basis for assessment to be made of the flood risks arising from the proposed development. Therefore the proposed development is contrary to Local Development Framework Policy CP21 and DP42 and National Planning Policy Framework.