**PLANNING APPLICATION №:**

**PLANNING APPEAL №:**

**DESCRIPTION:**

**TABLE 1: NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN POLICY CHECKLIST FOR THE REVIEW OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND APPEALS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Policy № & Title** | **Compliance Notes** | **Conclusion** |
| 1: Services, Facilities & Infrastructure | Will it have any significant impact on infrastructure? |  |
| 2A: Residential Housing Allocation | Is it an allocated site? |  |
| 2B: Residential Development Within the Settlement Boundary | Does it demonstrate acceptable density? |  |
| Does it satisfy LCA requirements? |  |
| Is any amenity impact acceptable? |  |
| 2C: Residential Development Outside the Settlement Boundary | If not an allocated site: |  |
| Is it immediately adjacent to boundary? |  |
| Is it an exception site? |  |
| 2D: Affordable Housing | Does it deliver affordable housing if applicable? |  |
| 2E: Housing Mix | Does it meet local need as set out in the Saham Toney Housing Needs Assessment? |  |
| 2F: Common Criteria for All Residential Sites | Is a satisfactory ecological assessment provided? |  |
| Are satisfactory biodiversity and wildlife friendly measures provided? |  |
| Does it enhance green infrastructure? |  |
| Does it demonstrate acceptable visibility splays? |  |
| 2G: Masterplanning | Is masterplanning required and if so is it acceptable? |  |
| 2H: Site Allocation STNP1: Grange Farm, Chequers Lane | Does it meet all criteria in the allocation policy? |  |
| 2I: Site Allocation STNP2: Disused Piggery, Off Hills Road | Does it meet all criteria in the allocation policy? |  |
| 2J: Site Allocation STNP 4: Land at the Junction of Pound Hill and Page’s Lane | Does it meet all criteria in the allocation policy? |   |
| **Policy № & Title** | **Compliance Notes** | **Conclusion** |
| 2K: Site Allocation STNP7: Page’s Farm | Does it meet all criteria in the allocation policy? |  |
| 2L: Site Allocation STNP9: Ovington Road | Does it meet all criteria in the allocation policy? |  |
| 2M: Site Allocation STNP13: Hill Farm | Does it meet all criteria in the allocation policy? |  |
| 2N: Site Allocation STNP14: Croft Field | Does it meet all criteria in the allocation policy? |  |
| 2O: Site Allocation STNP15: 8 Richmond Road | Does it meet all criteria in the allocation policy? |  |
| 2P: Site Allocation STNP16: Richmond Hall | Does it meet all criteria in the allocation policy? |  |
| 2Q: Amenity Land at Richmond Hall | Has STNP16 been completed? |  |
| Has public access been provided? |  |
| 3A: Design | Does design suit the local context and village vernacular? |  |
| If on the settlement edge, does development integrate with the countryside? |  |
| Are the height, scale and layout acceptable? |  |
| Does it increase tree cover? |  |
| If at risk of flooding are natural features used to mitigate that? |  |
| Are boundary treatments acceptable? |  |
| If applicable has a Key View been enhanced? |  |
| Are rear garden sizes acceptable? |  |
| If it is the area of any heritage asset is any impact acceptable? |  |
| Are sustainable materials proposed? |  |
| Will it provide a safe environment for people? |  |
| Is it on a rural lane, and if so does it provide an acceptable pedestrian access solution? |  |
| Are there any other significant contraventions of the Village Design Guide? |  |
| 3B: Density of Residential Developments | Does it meet the density guideline for its area? |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Policy № & Title** | **Compliance Notes** | **Conclusion** |
| 3C: Site Access and On-Site Streets | Is safe highway access provided? |  |
| Is the amount of traffic generated likely to be acceptable? |  |
| If applicable due to the development’s size, is more than one access provided for people and vehicles? |  |
| Have any necessary new pedestrian pavements been provided? |  |
| 3D: Parking | Does parking provision satisfy App. 2 of the Local Plan? |  |
| Is parking on-plot? |  |
| If parking is off-plot have acceptable bays been provided? |  |
| Has adequate cycle storage been provided? |  |
| Does it impact parking for existing properties? |  |
| Is there sufficient on-site parking for visitors? |  |
| Are parking courts proposed? |  |
| Are electric vehicle charging points provided? |  |
| 3E: Dark Skies Preservation | Is street lighting proposed, and if so is it acceptable? |  |
| 3F: Climate Change Adaptation & Mitigation | Has information been provided on adaptation to and mitigation of climate change, and if so is it acceptable? |  |
| Are low-carbon homes proposed? |  |
| Have materials been selected to reduce carbon emissions during their manufacture? |  |
| 4: Non-Residential Development | Is it appropriate with respect to landscape character? |  |
| Is the size and scale appropriate? |  |
| Are any amenity impacts acceptable? |  |
| Is the level of additional traffic that will be generated acceptable with respect to highway safety? |  |
| Is safe and suitable access provided? |  |
| Is adequate infrastructure in place to support it? |  |
| 5: Saham Toney Rural Gap | Is the site within the rural gap? |  |
| If so does it comprise essential utility infrastructure? |  |
| If not:* Is an acceptable Landscape and Visual Appraisal provided?
* Does it respect the open and undeveloped nature of the gap?
* Would it result in coalescence with Watton?
* Does it harm Saham’s rural setting?
* Would it enhance the landscape?
 |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Policy № & Title** | **Compliance Notes** | **Conclusion** |
| 6: Heritage Assets | Is it a designated or non-designated heritage asset? |  |
| If so would the significance of the asset be harmed? |  |
| Is the location one in which a site of find is defined in the Heritage Asset Register (and on Policy Maps 6C and 6D)? |  |
| If so have requirements for site investigations and recording been met? |  |
| 7A: Landscape Character Preservation & Enhancement | Does it conserve and enhance local landscape features? |  |
| Is its scale, location and design appropriate to landscape character? |  |
| Will it have any adverse impact on the area’s key natural, built or historic features? |  |
| Would its cumulative effect with other nearby development have an adverse impact on landscape character? |  |
| Where applicable does it retain rural spaces between existing settlement clusters? |  |
| Does it take account of the Saham Toney LCA? |  |
| If in the settlement fringe, does it avoid hard edges into open countryside and integrate with its open setting? |  |
| Is it in an area of high or moderate to high combined landscape sensitivity? |  |
| If so has an acceptable Landscape and Visual Appraisal been provided? |  |
| If outside the settlement boundary, does it address the opportunity and management aims set out in the LCA? |  |
| 7B: Key Views | Will it unacceptably impact a Key View? |  |
| If not but it is the area of a Key View, does it take opportunities to preserve and enhance that Key View? |  |
| 7C: Local Green Spaces | Is it in a designated Local Green Space? |  |
| 7D: Biodiversity & Habitats | Does it retain existing biodiversity features and where possible, enhance them? |  |
| Does it result in a net loss of biodiversity? |  |
| Does it impact any habitat shown on Policy Maps 7D.1a/b, 7D.2a/b, 7D.3a/b or 7D.4a/b or the ecological connectivity between them? |  |
| If so does an ecological assessment show that acceptable measures are proposed to mitigate any harm? |  |
| Does it improve habitats or networks, or the connectivity between green spaces? |  |
| Has any impact to a Site of Special Scientific Interest been acceptable addressed? |  |
| 7E: Green Infrastructure | Will it conserve and where possible enhance green infrastructure features of value and connectivity between them? |  |
| Are landscaping proposals acceptable? |  |
| Does it include any new water bodies? |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Policy № & Title** | **Compliance Notes** | **Conclusion** |
| 7F: Trees & Hedges | Has an on-site survey justified any proposed removal of trees? |  |
| Will it have harmful impact on ancient woodland or veteran trees? |  |
| Is any loss of trees or hedgerows adequately compensated? |  |
| Is the proposed level of new tree and hedge planting acceptable? |  |
| Are measures to protect existing trees and hedges acceptable? |  |
| If adjacent to ancient woodland or veteran trees has a buffer zone been provided? |  |
| 8: Surface Water Management | If classed as major development, has a site-specific Surface Water Drainage Strategy been provided and is it acceptable? |  |
| If classed as minor development, have acceptable details of surface water drainage proposals been provided? |  |
| If applicable have surface water runoff mitigation measures been incorporated? |  |
| Do on-site surface water storage and runoff rates meet the LLFA standards? |  |
| Has the Saham Toney SuDS Design Manual guidance been satisfactorily applied? |  |
| Will runoff impact a protected aquifer or the Breckland SPA or Norfolk SAC? |  |
| 9: Sewerage Provision | Is connection to the public foul sewer network proposed? |  |
| Has it been shown that there will be sufficient capacity in that network, at the treatment works and intermediate pumping stations? |  |
| If not are proposals for a private foul sewerage system acceptable? |  |
| If 10 or more houses are proposed has an acceptable sewerage capacity assessment been provided? |  |
| Has it been shown there will be no increased risk of flooding from foul sewers as a result of development? |  |

**TABLE 2: NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN SUPPORTING DOCUMENT CHECKLIST FOR THE REVIEW OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND APPEALS**

Beyond any reference made to them in the Neighbourhood Plan’s policies, do any aspects of the proposal contravene guidance given in the following documents?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Document Title** | **Compliance Notes** | **Satisfactory?** |
| Saham Toney Parish Landscape Character Assessment |  |  |
| Saham Toney Parish Design Guide |  |  |
| Saham Toney SuDS Design Manual |  |  |
| Saham Toney Parish Housing Needs Assessment |  |  |
| Saham Toney Masterplanning Report |  |  |
| Saham Toney Transport Study |  |  |
| Saham Toney Neighbourhood Plan SEA Report |  |  |
| Saham Toney Neighbourhood Plan HRA |  |  |

**TABLE 3: LOCAL PLAN POLICY CHECKLIST FOR THE REVIEW OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND APPEALS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Policy № & Title** | **Compliance Notes** | **Compliant?** |
| GEN 02: Promoting high Quality Design | Is design sensitive to the local character? |  |
| Does it make a positive architectural contribution to its context and location? |  |
| GEN 05: Settlement boundaries | Does it comply with other relevant policies of the Development Plan? |  |
| HOU 04: Villages with Boundaries | If outside the boundary, is it immediately adjacent to the boundary? |  |
| Is its scale and design appropriate? |  |
| Would it lead to the number of dwellings increasing by more than 33? |  |
| Does the design preserve the historic nature of the community? |  |
| Does it cause coalescence with another settlement? |  |
| HOU 06: Principle of New Housing | Is site density appropriate and justified? |  |
| HOU 07: Affordable Housing | Are 10 or more houses proposed and/or is the site area ≥ 0.5 hectares? |  |
| If so:* Are at least 25% of the houses affordable homes?
* Will the affordable homes be on-site?
* Will 70% of the affordable homes be for rent in perpetuity?
* Will the affordable homes be distributed across the site?
 |  |
| HOU 13: Rural Workers’ Dwellings | Does the development comprise a rural worker’s dwelling? |  |
| If so:* Has it been shown it is essential to the needs of the business?
* Has the business been established for at least 3 years and shown to be viable?
* Has it been shown that there is no other suitable accommodation on the site or nearby?
* Has it been shown that no single dwelling on the site has been sold on the open market in the last 5 years?
 |  |
| Is the house no larger than necessary? |  |
| Is the house sensitively designed? |  |
| Is satisfactory access provided? |  |
| Is it well landscaped to minimise visual intrusion? |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Policy № & Title** | **Compliance Notes** | **Compliant?** |
| HOU 14: Affordable Housing Exceptions | Is it a rural (affordable homes) exception site? |  |
| If so:* Will it deliver 100% affordable homes for local people in perpetuity?
* Is the site adjacent or well-related to the existing settlement?
* Is the design good and of appropriate size and scale to the area?
* Has clear evidence of viability been provided?
 |  |
| TR 01: Sustainable Transport Network | Is the location accessible to sustainable modes of transport? |  |
| Will it promote increased journeys on foot or by cycle? |  |
| TR 02: Transport Requirements | Will it integrate with the existing transport network? |  |
| Does it provide safe, suitable and convenient access for all users? |  |
| Is adequate parking provided? |  |
| Is it likely to generate a significant number of HGV movements? |  |
| If so has a Routing Management Plan shown there will be no severe impacts to the road network or the living conditions of residents? |  |
| If it is a major development, does it include an acceptable transport impact assessment? |  |
| ENV 01: Green Infrastructure | Does it safeguard and where possible enhance green infrastructure? |  |
| If not, will adequate compensatory measures be incorporated? |  |
| Does it incorporate green infrastructure and enhance existing connectivity? |  |
| ENV 02: Biodiversity Protection & Enhancement | Is it likely to have an adverse impact on a protected site? |  |
| If so:* Has it been shown there are reasons that outweigh the ecological harm?
* Has it been shown the development cannot be located on an alternative site with less harm?
* Has it been shown that residual harm will be adequately compensated for?
* Has a stepwise approach to mitigating biodiversity harm been demonstrated?
* Have net gains for biodiversity been demonstrated?
 |  |
| ENV 03: The Brecks Protected Habitats & Species | Is the site within either of the Breckland SPA buffer zones or within a defined 1km square having a functional link to the SPA? |  |
| If so has an acceptable project level HRA been provided? |  |
| ENV 04: Open Space, Sport & Recreation | Will it result in any loss of designated open space? |  |
| If so has it been justified by an acceptable assessment? |  |
| Is it on open space with an ecological value? |  |
| If so does it provide alternative space of equal or greater value? |  |
| Will there be 11 or more new houses? |  |
| If so does it provide the specified amount of open space? |  |
| If not, are acceptable contributions proposed? |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Policy № & Title** | **Compliance Notes** | **Compliant?** |
| ENV 05: Protection & Enhancement of the Landscape | Will it contribute to and where possible enhance the local environment? |  |
| Does it have acceptable regard to the Breckland LCA and Settlement Fringe Assessment? |  |
| ENV 06: Trees, Hedgerows & Development | If trees will be lost are there exceptional and overriding benefits to justify that? |  |
| If protected trees or hedgerows will be lost, is that outweighed by a substantially improved approach to the site’s design and landscaping? |  |
| Where loss is unavoidable has adequate provision been made for replacement? |  |
| Are acceptable measures proposed to protect retained trees and hedgerows during construction? |  |
| ENV 07: Designated Heritage Assets | Will it impact on the significance of an asset? |  |
| If so has acceptable evidence been provided to assess the impact? |  |
| Will it conserve the architectural and historic character of the asset? |  |
| ENV 08: Non-Designated Heritage Assets | Will it conserve, and if possible enhance the historic character, appearance and setting of the asset? |  |
| ENV 09: Flood Risk & Surface Water Drainage | Will it minimise the risk of flooding? |  |
| Does it utilise SuDS?  |  |
| Does it incorporate flood risk mitigation measures? |  |
| Has it been shown it will not increase the pre-existing greenfield runoff rate? |  |
| Has it been shown that it will not increase the vulnerability of the site or wider catchment area to surface water flooding? |  |
| If applicable does it address potential impact of infiltration on a groundwater source protection zone? |  |
| If in a medium or high-risk zone has an acceptable site-specific Flood Risk Assessment been provided? |  |
| If it is major development on a non-allocated site and a sequential test has shown there is no alternative site available, has an acceptable exception test result been provided? |  |
| Does it provide the information set out by the LLFA to determine the application? |  |
| Does it satisfactorily reflect LLFA guidelines and best practice? |  |
| Does it provide acceptable means of adoption and lifetime maintenance of the drainage system? |  |
| Is the volume of runoff shown to be acceptable? |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Policy № & Title** | **Compliance Notes** | **Compliant?** |
| COM 01: Design | Is design to the highest possible standards? |  |
| Does it preserve or enhance the special character of the historic environment? |  |
| Does it integrate to a high degree of compatibility with the surrounding area? |  |
| Does it incorporate sustainable design and durable construction? |  |
| Does it reflect best practice in energy efficiency and climate change mitigation? |  |
| Does it use high quality materials and details that respect or improve local character? |  |
| Does it acceptably integrate with its surroundings? |  |
| Is high quality hard and soft landscaping integral to the development? |  |
| Is it designed to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour? |  |
| Does it provide acceptable facilities for waste collection and recycling? |  |
| Does it provide safe access without compromising highway safety? |  |
| COM 03: Protection of Amenity | In terms of private amenity space; overlooking; overbearing impact / visual dominance; overshadowing; loss of daylight; odour, noise, vibration or other forms of nuisance; or pollution: |  |
| Will it have unacceptable impacts on the residential amenity of neighbours? |  |
| Will it provide adequate levels of amenity for future residents? |  |