

Planning application to be considered 16/6/26 3053/25/FUL

Location Land At Sx 448 762 Rushford Lamerton

Whilst the revised NPPF emphasises the aim to increase housing delivery where a 5-year land supply does not exist, this does not change the need to balance the benefits against the harms.

Lamerton has limited facilities (nearest convenience store 3/4 mile from the site along roads with no footpath) a restricted bus service, a primary school with a finite capacity, and a reliance on vehicular transport. In my opinion the additional harms deriving from this proposal result in the overall harm outweighing any benefit accruing from the proposal and it should be opposed. Specifically:-

1. **Sustainable development:** Lamerton is a tier 3 sustainable village; there is an expectation that development will come forward through a Neighbourhood Development Plan. This site was not offered or considered in the preparation of the NP, now completed Reg 14. The Application Site lies outside the proposed revised Lamerton settlement boundary and previous settlement boundary. Such sites should be brought forward as Rural Exception Sites (Lamerton Neighbourhood Development Plan-PolicyH1, to which some weight might be attached). Outside the Settlement Boundary there will be a presumption against residential development unless the proposal meets the requirements of JLP policies TTV26 or TTV27 and relevant Neighbourhood Plan policies (to which some weight might be attached). This site does not meet the criteria of TTV26 or 27
2. **Housing mix/need** DEV8 :- with an oversupply of 3 and 4 bedroomed homes in Lamerton, this proposal offering 2 properties with 4 or more bedrooms fails to meet the requirement to address the imbalance within the housing stock;
3. The inclusion of a 2 bedroomed family house is of limited benefit in addressing the overall need for small 1 & 2 bedroomed affordable housing of various tenures (Lamerton's Housing Need Assessment January 2022). Whilst WDBC senior housing officer notes that housing for social rent is preferred by that Council, Lamerton's HNA found a demand predominantly for shared ownership for local people, as identified in the survey and by reference to the definitions of "local" applied. TTV27 requires development in the open countryside to be limited to circumstances where it is meeting a proven local need, not the need of the wider locality.

4. Whilst an affordable house for shared ownership for a family might help towards this need, this site is not well related to the facilities within the settlement- the school, community centre, pub and convenience store all being accessed along a busy road where traffic is known to speed and with no footpaths and a minimum distance of 1/2 mile.
5. The site location, at a distance from the centre of the community, will require dependence on the use of vehicles to access facilities even close by and to ensure the safety of residents as walking and cycling would be less than safe.
6. **Siting, scale and design:** DEV20 & DEV23: Harm to the sensitive landscape has to be weighed against potential benefits.
7. The proposal sites 3 detached properties at 90 degrees to the main road and located behind an existing dwelling. In terms of density and layout this is out of keeping with the linear form of existing development in the village generally and at Rushford in particular. It is felt this does not relate well to the existing dwellings or conserve the character of the landscape
8. DEV1 & DEV6. The lack of amenity space and the layout for the enjoyment of such by each of the proposed dwellings is a further concern and not in keeping with existing dwellings in the locality
9. LNDP Policy H5 (Design and Quality) (to which some weight might be attached), requires (inter alia) that proposals protect “ individuals and property from overlooking and loss of privacy, overshadowing and overbearing impacts, and unreasonable noise and disturbance”; the application does not address these issues in so far as they relate to the subject sites, adjacent property and gardens.
10. **Access** DEV29 and LNDP Policy H7 (to which some weight might be attached) requires a demonstrable safe and suitable access to the site for all people, not causing a significant impact on the local road network that cannot be managed or mitigated. Reference is made to LPC’s detailed comments in relation to safety in its objection to an earlier iteration of this application dated 14/1/2026. The application and supporting information does not address the practicalities of the construction phase nor issues of privacy, overlooking and light pollution.
11. **Parking:** JLP / SDP 2020 minimum provision and LNDP (to which some weight might be attached), Appendix 10 Guideline 9: Provision for 2 & 3 bed houses is 2 per house and for larger properties 3 spaces- this minimum is not met; additional off-road visitor parking spaces is desirable especially given the current necessity for the occupiers of existing adjacent properties to park on the road.