

PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT

Case Officer: Jacqueline Houslander

Parish: Harberton **Ward:** West Dart

Application No: 3155/20/FUL

Agent/Applicant:

Mr James Whilding - Acorus
Addlepool Business Centre
Woodbury Road
Clyst St George, Exeter
EX3 0NR

Applicant:

Mr D Camp
Daynes Farm
Road From Broadpark Stile Cross
Harberton
TQ9 7FB

Site Address: Daynes Farm, Harberton, TQ9 7FB

Development: Erection of farm shop/butchery building and provision of associated infrastructure



Reason item is being put before Committee: Councillor McKay wants the application to be heard by Committee because:

The proposal should be supported and is in accordance with policy DEV15.

Recommendation:

Refusal

Reasons for refusal

1. The proposed development does not meet the requirements for sustainable development, as set out in Policies SPT1, SPT2 and TTV1 and whilst farming itself is appropriate in the countryside, it is not essential for a butchery and farm shop to be located in the open countryside. The proposal does not demonstrate that locating the development in the countryside would meet the principles of sustainable development.
2. The impact of the access to the development with its wide visibility splay would result in the significant loss of Devon hedge and two trees, one of which is protected. The impact of the visibility splay on the rural landscape would be significant and would harm the rural character currently apparent in the area contrary to Policy DEV23 of the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan and para 170 of the NPPF 2019.
3. The proposal would not meet policy DEV15.8 in the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan, as it would introduce significantly more private cars to the area and walking and cycling would be dangerous along narrow rural lanes; as well as lacking any relationship with the existing buildings on the farming enterprise.
4. The use of timber effect cladding would not be acceptable in design and landscape terms and so the development would fail to meet policies DEV23 and DEV20 of the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan or the NPPF paragraph 170 and 163.
5. No ecological information has been submitted with the proposal and the proposed loss of a hedgerow and trees would be very likely to have an impact on ecology. The Local Planning Authority are therefore unable to confirm whether protected species would be harmed as a result of the development, contrary to Policy DEV26 in the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan and para. 175 of the NPPF 2019, as well as sections 40 and 47 of the NERC Act 2006 and Part 3 of the Habitats Regulations 2017.
6. No carbon reductions measures have been provided to demonstrate that the carbon footprint of the development has been reduced, contrary to Policy DEV32 of the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan and para. 153.

Key issues for consideration: Principle; location of development; access; impact on the countryside and landscape; design; highway impacts; carbon reduction; ecology.

Site Description: The application site is located in the countryside approximately 700 metres north of the A391 and approximately 800 metres from Harberton village centre.

The farm has a dwelling, plus 3 large agricultural buildings and a smaller farm building on the north eastern end of one of the larger buildings. There is a yard area between the buildings. The Design and Access Statement indicates that *“Daynes Farm is a family owned holding, which forms part of the Applicants’ wider farm business.”*..... *“The applicants operate their farm business on an organic basis, and grow arable crops and rear livestock, namely beef cattle, lambs and goats.”*

The adjacent road which would serve the development is a narrow rural road with passing places only. Devon hedgebanks run along the edge of the road.

The landscape is not covered by any landscape designations. Agriculturally the land is Grade 2 which is described as very good quality agricultural land.

The Proposal:

The building is proposed to be located in a field to the north east of the farmhouse. The field is currently grazing land. Vehicular access to the site is proposed via an existing field gate with a track running diagonally across the field to the proposed location of the building.

The access plan indicates that there would be orchard trees planted in the land surrounding the access track.

The position of the access has been changed and a revised plan submitted which indicates the access moving north to a point where there is an existing field gate. To create a 70m visibility splay at this access point a further oak tree would need to be felled.

The access track is proposed to be compacted hardcore leading to a similarly surfaced parking area next to the proposed building, providing 5 spaces, one of which has larger dimensions to accommodate disabled vehicles.

It is proposed that the shop will sell meat and seasonal vegetables predominately grown by the farm business and processed on site. Currently the applicants have some direct sales, however this will increase with the provision of the necessary facilities on site.

The proposed building is a flat roof, single storey building, with a steel framed and timber effect cladding. The building measures 10 metres by 3 metres and is marginally above 2 metres at its highest point.

Consultations:

- County Highways Authority: Consultation response to original access, dated 16/12/2021. The proposals are likely to increase the amount of traffic using the existing access, which is restricted in visibility terms. Unfortunately a very large native tree is situated on the northern side of the access that is the causation for the lack of visibility and concerns are raised that in order to comply with the national guidelines, the tree would need to be removed to form the recommended visibility splay. The access is currently made up of a loose bound stone material.

Revised details were provided and the Highway Authority commented further as follows:

Following initial concerns raised by the Highway Authority regarding the available visibility at the existing access it is noted the applicant has produced an alternative access arrangement plan (Drawing 200-05), which includes a new vehicle access further to the north. The Highway Authority has revisited the site to check whether the presented visibility splay dimensions are adequate and concludes that they are agreeable. There is however a lack of detail on the drawing in respect of the following -

- Visibility splay height (recommended to be 600mm).
- Typical cross section through the visibility splay to show how it will be treated in terms of levels, planting and visual appearance.
- 12mm height kerb at the access between the concrete apron and the carriageway.
- Drainage details to show how water will be prevented from discharging and pooling on the highway.
- Any gates to be set back enough from the highway to accommodate the largest expected vehicle.
- Gates to open inwards towards the field.

- Whilst the new vehicle access is welcomed from a highway safety perspective, no details are submitted to physically restrict vehicle access to the farm shop from the original access.
- Details should be submitted showing what measures will be introduced prior to the farm shop opening to the public. These details can then be conditioned appropriately.
- Construction/Material Details of the access track and parking/turning areas between the Farm Shop/Butchery building and the highway should be requested to demonstrate that mud, stones, water and debris will not be deposited on the highway and also to ensure that the track is visually acceptable

- Environmental Health Section: No EH concerns relevant to planning
- Town/Parish Council: SUPPORT the application with the following comments:
The Parish Council refers the planning authority to the results of the 2015 Harberton Parish Neighbourhood Plan consultation survey, noting that when asked for their view on rural land use, 87% agreed or strongly agreed that they would support the development of more farm shops selling local produce and 72% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they would like to see organic farming develop over the next 15 years.
The Parish Council notes Highways visibility concerns and proposed removal of a large native tree. The Parish Council does not wish to lose the tree, but if it has to be removed, the landowner follows the Woodland Trust guidelines to plant 3 trees to any 1 removed.
- Tree Specialist: The tree specialist was concerned about the original access position because of the presence of two large trees, which he served a Tree Preservation Order notice. His original response was objection as being contrary to Policy DEV 28 of the JLP.

The new plan indicates the proposed access moving northwards so that it has to cross the field diagonally down to the location of the proposed farm shop. The proposed new access also involves the felling of a tree in order to provide a visibility splay. Revised comments indicate support in this case:

No objection on arboricultural merit subject, noting a requirement for a landscape plan to mitigate for the lost tree and soften the access track.

- Drainage: No objection, subject to conditions for full details of the surface water and foul drainage to be submitted for approval.

Representations:

35 letters of support have been submitted, with the following summarised comments:

- Fantastic proposal which supports the sustainable growth of this local business.
- As we move away from intensive agriculture it is local initiatives like this where traditional farming models are allowed to diversify and value added at source.
- This will enable the family to supply quality homebred fed meat and other produce direct to the consumer
- Less food miles and full traceability of where the food is from
- Support and encouragement should be given to local businesses.
- There is overwhelming support for a shop in the area in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan
The farm is located within walking distance of the farm
Meets the Council's climate change goals – organic meat; reared on the premises.
The loss of the trees whilst sad, the applicant is keen to plant new trees.
- Having a farm shop nearby would be welcomed.
- The NP supports the development of more farm shops selling local produce (87% agreed).
- Locals would also be in favour of a replacement tree planting scheme.

- Will be able to walk or cycle to the farm shop.
- We should be supporting businesses fulfilling low carbon endeavours
- The farm is within easy reach of two villages and there is already some sale of the organic meat.
- We should be supporting local farms.
- At the moment villagers need to drive to Totnes or Harbertonford to access shops.
- The family have worked hard to develop their organic meat business.

Relevant Planning History

23/1898/13/F

Harberton Totnes Devon TQ9 7FB

Erection of permanent agricultural workers dwelling

Conditional approval, 20/09/2013

381/17/AGR

Daynes Farm Broadpark Style Cross to Fordbarn Cross along Zc205 Harberton Devon TQ9 7FB

Agricultural prior notification for the erection of an Agricultural building

Ag Determination details not required.

ANALYSIS

Principle of Development/Sustainability:

The principle of the proposed development must be considered against the underlying philosophy of the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan which indicates support for sustainable development. Policies SPT1, SPT2 and TTV1 provide for growth in sustainable locations. Policy TTV1 provides a hierarchy for growth in the Thriving Towns and Villages Policy Area of which this application site is part. This site would fall within the countryside. Development in the countryside is the 4th tier in the hierarchy, with the highest tier being development in the main towns of the Policy Area, where wider services are available. In tier 4 areas development will only be permitted where *“it can be demonstrated to support the principles of sustainable development and sustainable communities (Policies SPT1 and 2) including as provided for in Policies TTV26 and TTV27.”*

The Design and Access statement indicates that *“Currently despite the livestock being reared organically, there is no ability for the applicants to have the livestock slaughtered and processed organically and therefore they are unable to market them on this basis. The Applicants are therefore seeking to provide their own butchery facilities to enable them to directly market their organically reared stock and to sell seasonal vegetables.*

2.4 The proposal is deemed to be ancillary to the ongoing agricultural enterprises on the holding and wider farm business. The ability to add value and maximise alternative income streams is particularly important for farming businesses such as Daynes Farm.”

Whilst this is a laudable aim, the reasoning provided does not provide a justification to support the principles of sustainable development, as required by Policy TTV1. The reasoning also only relates to the butchery element of the proposal and does not provide any justification at all for the farm shop element of the proposal. The proposal does not comply with the principles of locating development in sustainable locations as proposed by policies SPT1, SPT2 and TTV1.

Policy TTV26 as referred to in Policy TTV1 relates to development in the countryside. The policy states:

“The LPAs will protect the special characteristics and role of the countryside. The following provisions will apply to the consideration of development proposals:

1. Isolated development in the countryside will be avoided and only permitted in exceptional circumstances, such as where it would:

- i. Meet an essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside and maintain that role for the development in perpetuity; or*
- ii. Secure the long term future and viable use of a significant heritage asset; or*
- iii. Secure the re-use of redundant or disused buildings and brownfield sites for an appropriate use; or*
- iv. Secure a development of truly outstanding or innovative sustainability and design, which helps to raise standards of design more generally in the rural area, significantly enhances its immediate setting, and is sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area; or*
- v. Protect or enhance the character of historic assets and their settings.*

2. Development proposals should, where appropriate:

- i. Protect and improve public rights of way and bridleways.*
- ii. Re-use traditional buildings that are structurally sound enough for renovation without significant enhancement or alteration.*
- iii. Be complementary to and not prejudice any viable agricultural operations on a farm and other existing viable uses.*
- iv. Respond to a proven agricultural, forestry and other occupational need that requires a countryside location.*
- v. Avoid the use of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land.*
- vi. Help enhance the immediate setting of the site and include a management plan and exit strategy that demonstrates how long term degradation of the landscape and natural environment will be avoided.”*

In this case the proposal seeks to erect a farm shop and butchery building to the north of the existing farm buildings, with a new access route across the field from the existing entrance. The building proposed is single storey, steel framed with timber cladding.

Policy TTV26 makes reference to isolated development (part 1 of the policy) and differentiates this from the general criteria which must be met in the countryside as a whole (part 2 of the policy). The application site is located in the open countryside down narrow rural lanes. However the village of Harberton is under a kilometre to the north, where there is a church, a parish hall and a public house. The A391 is a short distance away which provides access to Totnes and Kingsbridge. When considering isolation using both the Braintree and Bramshill rulings, the site is close to existing farm buildings and the farmhouse and there is another farm complex to the north east on adjacent land, so it is not physically isolated, but it is some distance from the settlement of Harberton, and so it is not edge of settlement, so would not meet the Bramshill ruling (which accepts that ‘isolated’ can be considered away from settlements). The Braintree ruling for isolated states that to be isolated development must be far away from people and places. In this case officers consider that it would meet the Braintree ruling.

Therefore, it is worth considering Part 1 of the policy. In order to be an acceptable development under part 1, the development needs to meet the criteria outlined. In this case the development is not a dwelling and so some criteria must be discounted, however neither does it meet any of the other criteria. The proposal would therefore be contrary to TTV26.1 The second part of the policy TTV26 is relevant. The proposal is for a new build and not a conversion and the uses are proposed as a farm butchery and farm shop. The second part of

the policy does not allow for such uses as it is not essential that the farm shop or indeed the butchery be located at the farm. They could just as easily be located in or on the edge of a settlement and thus in a more sustainable location. It is considered that the proposal fails to meet policy TTV26.

Policy DEV15 in the JLP supports the rural economy. The opening statement states *“Support will be given to proposals in suitable locations which seek to improve the balance of jobs within the rural areas and diversify the rural economy.”*

Parts 5, 6 and 8 of the policy are relevant to this proposal. Part 5 states:

“The creation of new, or extensions to existing, garden centres or farm shops in the open countryside and unrelated to a settlement will only be permitted if the proposed development is ancillary to, and on the site of, an existing horticultural business or existing farming operation, and provided that 75 per cent of the goods sold will be produced within the immediate and adjoining parishes.”

The proposal is located on an existing farming operation so would meet the policy in that regard. Subsequent information received from the applicant indicates that *“90-95% will be produced on the holding with the remainder sourced from local producers from the South Devon Veg co-op.* The proposal can therefore be said to meet part 5 of the policy.

Part 6 states: *“Development will be supported which meets the essential needs of agriculture or forestry interests”.* In this case the development of the farm shop cannot be said to be essential to the purposes of agriculture and forestry.

The butchery could be said to support the agricultural needs of the farm, by providing a space on site in which to butcher the animals reared on the farm. The result of this will clearly be to reduce food miles in relation to the cattle, as they would not need to go to an abattoir elsewhere and potentially brought back to local shops to be sold to the consumer. The farm shop would also be selling produce mainly from the farm. However these uses are to support the farm rather than essential to it. As a consequence the proposal does not meet part 6 of the policy.

Part 8 applies to all employment development in rural area and states:

“Development proposals should:

- i. Demonstrate safe access to the existing highway network.*
- ii. Avoid a significant increase in the number of trips requiring the private car and facilitate the use of sustainable transport, including walking and cycling, where appropriate. Sustainable Travel Plans will be required to demonstrate how the traffic impacts of the development have been considered and mitigated.*
- iii. Demonstrate how a positive relationship with existing buildings has been achieved, including scale, design, massing and orientation.*
- iv. Avoid incongruous or isolated new buildings. If there are unused existing buildings within the site, applicants are required to demonstrate why these cannot be used for the uses proposed before new buildings will be considered.”*

In this case the visibility splay required to create an appropriate access to the site results in the loss of a significant amount of hedgerow and a large oak tree. The visibility splay will create an engineered access in an area where such an access will be incongruous and completely alter the character of the lane to the detriment of the character of the area as a

whole. Officers conclude that whilst a safe access could be provided, the visual impacts would be too significant.

The proposal would result in an increase in the number of trips by private cars. Whilst there is a bus which runs past the site, *“the 164 Totnes-Kingsbridge bus route which passes four times a day six days a week.”* as described in the Travel Plan and walking and cycling along these rural roads is possible, without any pavements or street lighting it would be dangerous for pedestrians.

The applicant’s Travel plan indicates that the intention would be to provide 5 car parking spaces, a bike rack and EV charging points for bikes and cars on the site. The shop would have limited opening times to begin with, and one member of staff 1 day per week. *“Delivery vehicles would be minimal as 90% of the produce is from our own farm. The farm shop is to be run/managed by the family onsite.”* Other measures proposed are:

- A travel information pack..., include a map of where we are, distances to the bus route Daynes Farm is on. Distance from the Totnes train station (2.9 miles away) and distance from the national cycle path (1.3 miles on country roads).
- The electric car & EBIKE charging points would be powered by the solar panels already in place.
- Daynes Farm is on the 164 Totnes-Kingsbridge bus route which passes four times a day six days a week.
- promote using public transport as an easy accessible way of getting to us.
- Promote walking from Harberton(0.6 miles); Harbertonford(1.2 miles) and Totnes(2.5 miles).
- *“We are a forward thinking organic farm; the environment matters to us. The promotion of walking, cycling, bus use and lift sharing is really important and we will maximise this.”*
- Encourage residents/employees to switch their travel to a more sustainable mode.

Whilst the measures indicated in the travel plan are positive for local people, there is nothing in the Travel Plan about the marketing approach. If it is the local area that the applicants are providing for, how will this be managed? The aim of the proposal to be able to sell their organic produce is a laudible one, but it is assumed that it will need to be a viable operation and one which will probably require more than just local custom. How will traffic from the A391 be managed?

Officers consider that the Travel Plan has not gone far enough in terms of the wider customers that may be attracted to it. The issue of deliveries to the farm has been addressed, but the issue of the farm delivering their goods has not. Is it the intention to deliver to local outlets?

Item three and four in policy DEV15.8 relates to the relationship with existing buildings. The Farm shop is to the north east of the existing farm buildings. Approximately 35 metres away, which is a considerable distance. It would not be seen in the landscape as part of the farmyard, but as a separate building, particularly as it is also set on higher land than the other farm buildings. It therefore does not have a positive relationship with the existing farm buildings on the farm. In terms of scale the building is far smaller than the farm buildings on the site already. No narrative about the potential re use of those existing buildings has been provided with the application. If this siting is the only one, it is too far removed from the existing farm buildings.

Officers therefore conclude that whilst some areas of policy DEV15 are satisfied, overall there is insufficient evidence, to demonstrate that all of the issues with travel to and from the

shop have been addressed and appropriately mitigated, nor is it essential for agricultural or forestry purposes that it be located in the countryside. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DEV15.

Design/Landscape:

The proposed building is single storey measuring 10 metres by 6 metres. Half of the building is proposed as farm shop, Of the other part of the building, half would be the butchery and processing area and the other half comprises the chiller and a wc and entrance lobby. The majority of the building would therefore be for the farm shop.

The building has a flat roof and details of the material to be used on this element of the building has not been provided. The walls are described on the application form as being timber effect cladding on a steel frame. Timber effect cladding would not be acceptable in this rural area. The material can be appropriate in built up areas of towns, but not in the open countryside, where more natural materials should be used. If real timber cladding was used it would fade to a grey/silver colour and blend naturally into the countryside. The timber effect cladding would not fade and would appear an incongruous material, and would impact negatively on this rural location contrary to Policy DEV23 and Policy DEV20 of the JLP.

The proposed building and long access drive also extends the farming enterprise into a new field. Whereas the existing farm is compact and contained, the proposed building and in particular the long access track as well as the significant removal of hedge and a mature tree for the visibility splay would impact on the landscape negatively.

Neighbour Amenity:

There are no immediate neighbours to the farm and so there are no residential amenity issues.

Highways/Access:

Subsequent to the discussions about the tree and the access, an alternative access was proposed further away from the farm access and across a field currently laid to grass. It would also involve the removal of a hedgerow tree to create appropriate visibility. The Tree Specialist has accepted the loss of the tree in this case on the basis that a further tree would be planted and that the access track would need to be softened. The highway authority have indicated that there is insufficient information for them to be completely satisfied with the proposal and suggest a condition be applied to the consent to seek the additional information.

Officers are of the view that a condition may be acceptable, but in the first instance it is necessary to consider the impact of the visibility splay on the landscape.

The required visibility splay indicated on the drawings is 35 metres in each direction. Of that 35 metres at least 30 metres in each direction of existing Devon hedgerow would be lost. The hedgerow in this location are relatively high and established. The loss of the hedges would impact significantly on the character of the road, which is currently narrow, small in scale and lined with hedgerows and trees. The loss of a 70 metre section of hedge in order to create a visibility splay would, Officers consider, be detrimental to the character of the lane.

Whilst the Highway officer is content to wait for detailed drawings of the visibility splay Officers are concerned that this approach would be accepting of the principle of such a large visibility splay in a rural single track lane. Officers are of the view that the new position of the

proposed access is unacceptable because of the landscape impact. Policy DEV23 seeks to ensure that development conserves and enhances the landscape. This proposal would fail to do so.

Drainage:

The application site is in Flood Zone 1, where the risk of flooding is low. It is proposed that surface water run off would be piped to a nearby watercourse and foul drainage will be sent to a new septic tank. Any waste washings would be collected in a separate container and disposed of offsite by a registered contractor. The drainage engineers is satisfied with these measures subject to receiving detailed information prior to development extending beyond slab level.

Ecology:

A wildlife table was completed indicating that there would be no impacts on ecology as a result of the development. However the proposal does involve the loss of a significant stretch of hedgerow and two large trees, as well as grassland where the building, access track and car parking area are proposed. It is considered that if the application were to be carried out there could be an impact on ecology and protected wildlife the extent of which cannot be considered as no ecology report has been provided.

Climate change:

The applicant's supplementary statement and travel plan indicate that by having a butchery on site, there will be a reduction in food miles as they would no longer need to take their cattle to an abattoir elsewhere. Officers acknowledge that this would be a benefit in terms of reducing the carbon footprint. However, no other carbon reduction measures have been proposed. The Planning statement indicates that there are existing solar panels on one of the agricultural buildings, however policy DEV32 seeks all new development to provide carbon reduction measures. As none have been specifically provided for this development proposal, the proposal fails to meet that policy.

Support for the proposal

It is noted that there are many letters of support for the proposal as well as support from the Parish Council. The letters of support refer to the reduction in food miles; the need to support local businesses; the benefits of diversification; the support needed for less intensive farming techniques. All of these issues are supported by the Local Authority, however in this case the manifestation of the farm shop results in the removal of a substantial amount of Devon hedge; the loss of a tree; the change in character of the road and area' potential impacts on ecology and no new carbon reduction measures. All of which mean that the proposal contravenes adopted planning policy.

The Parish Council have made reference to the emerging NP noting the local support for more farm shops. Officers acknowledge this and agree that farm shops do add to the local economy, however in agreeing this they should also not impact on the principle of sustainable development identified in the strategic policies in the Plan nor impact on the environment within which they are located. Unfortunately in this case officers are of the view that the impacts of the proposal outweigh the benefits of a farm shop in this location.

Conclusion

The proposed development does not meet the requirements of sustainable development as set out in Policies SPT1, SPT2 and TTV1 and whilst farming itself is appropriate in the countryside, it is not essential for a butchery and farm-shop to be located in the open countryside.

The impact of the development with a wide visibility splay would result in the significant loss of Devon Hedge and two trees one of which is protected. The impact of that on the rural landscape would be significant and would therefore be contrary to Policy DEV23. Whilst Policy DEV15 does allow for new farm shops in the open countryside, it does not meet the policy because there has been no demonstration that 75% of the goods sold would be from immediate or adjoining parishes and in any case the proposal would not meet part 8 of the policy. In design terms the proposed farm shop is some distance from the existing farm buildings and would therefore be seen on its own. This as well as the proposed use of timber effect cladding would not be acceptable in design and landscape terms and so the development would fail to meet policies DEV23 and DEV20. No ecological information has been submitted and the significant proposed loss of a hedgerow and trees would be very likely to have an impact on ecology. Finally no carbon reductions measures have been provided to demonstrate that the carbon footprint of the development has been reduced. The proposal is recommended for refusal

This application has been considered in accordance with Section 38 of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

Planning Policy

Relevant policy framework

Section 70 of the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act requires that regard be had to the development plan, any local finance and any other material considerations. Section 38(6) of the 2004 Planning and Compensation Act requires that applications are to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. For the purposes of decision making, as of March 26th 2019, the Plymouth & South West Devon Joint Local Plan 2014 - 2034 is now part of the development plan for Plymouth City Council, South Hams District Council and West Devon Borough Council (other than parts of South Hams and West Devon within Dartmoor National Park).

The relevant development plan policies are set out below:

The Plymouth & South West Devon Joint Local Plan was adopted by South Hams District Council on March 21st 2019 and West Devon Borough Council on March 26th 2019.

SPT1 Delivering sustainable development
SPT2 Sustainable linked neighbourhoods and sustainable rural communities
TTV1 Prioritising growth through a hierarchy of sustainable settlements
TTV26 Development in the Countryside
DEV1 Protecting health and amenity
DEV15 Supporting the rural economy
DEV20 Place shaping and the quality of the built environment
DEV23 Landscape character
DEV26 Protecting and enhancing biodiversity and geological conservation
DEV28 Trees, woodlands and hedgerows
DEV29 Specific provisions relating to transport
DEV32 Delivering low carbon development
DEV35 Managing flood risk and Water Quality Impacts

Neighbourhood Plan

The application lies in the area covered by Harberton Neighbourhood Plan. The Plan is currently at regulation 7 stage whereby an area has been designated, but there are no specific policies in place at this stage.

Other material considerations include the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) including but not limited to paragraphs 2, 11, 157, 167, 174, 179, and guidance in Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).

Considerations under Human Rights Act 1998 and Equalities Act 2010

The provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 and Equalities Act 2010 have been taken into account in reaching the recommendation contained in this report.