1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 This outline application proposes up to 4 market dwellings on a site in the countryside which has recently been granted planning approval for a traveller’s site, at appeal. As the site is in the countryside, development is strictly controlled by Policy CS1 and Policy CS2 lists exceptions which would be allowed. This proposal does not fall within those exceptions, and a previous application for four residential plots on the site in 2003 was refused on policy grounds. The potential loss of 3 traveller’s sites is also of concern, as the Council needs to show a ten year supply, and this may lead to sites having to be sought elsewhere in the district. The outline application seeks approval for access only at this stage, and County Highways have recommended that whilst the indicative layout shows adequate parking and turning, the access road needs to be upgraded to ensure it is safe. Whilst this is not a reason for refusal, it would be a costly endeavour. Given that the proposal is contrary to Policies CS1 and CS2, and also National Planning Policy Framework guidance, the application is recommended for REFUSAL.

1.1 A site visit has been arranged for 11.45am, prior to the Planning Committee meeting.
THE APPLICATION

2.1 This application is for outline planning consent for up to 4 dwellings on the site. Only access is to be determined at this stage, with appearance, landscaping, layout and scale reserved for future consideration. Indicative plans have been submitted showing 4 dwellings as 2 x 2 semi detached properties with parking to the front of each dwelling, 2 visitor spaces and an access area and turning space. The properties would face Hod Hall Lane, with their rear gardens facing south. The Existing building in the south west corner of the site would be demolished. The access would be taken from the existing access to Hod Hall Lane.

2.2 The application is supported by a Planning statement and a Geo-Environmental Desk Study Report.

THE APPLICANT’S CASE

3.1 The Applicant has submitted a Planning Statement in support of his application, which can be viewed online via East Cambridgeshire District Council’s Public Access online service, via the following link: http://pa.eastcambs.gov.uk/online-applications/ inputting the reference 13/00856/OUT, clicking on the Documents tab and then choosing ‘view associated documents’. Alternatively a paper copy is available to view at the East Cambridgeshire District Council offices, in the application file.

3.2 The application proposals have regard to the National Planning Policy Framework which has a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Our statement has demonstrated that the proposal will represent a sustainable development because it will deliver a development in a sustainable location, addressing social, economic and environmental factors.

3.3 The land, whilst deemed countryside in local policy terms, the LPA has to balance this against other factors, including:

- Core Strategy policies being out of date and kilter with the NPPF. They are unduly restrictive, not reflecting the Government’s emphasis on growth
- Lack of demonstrable 5 year housing supply
- The brownfield nature of the site as a builders’ yard – NPPF favours re use of such land
- The permission for 3 pitches (6 caravans) for gypsies and travellers; and its likely impacts
- Whether a small scale housing site is more harmful to countryside character than the extant use as a builders’ yard or the permitted use as a gypsy site
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• Public opinion (ie Localism) concerning the travellers use allowed on appeal
• Lack of visual prominence (and therefore harm) of the site from public vantage points; good existing landscaping to boundaries

3.4 The proposed development can occur without undue impact on visual or residential amenity, local character, highway safety or the countryside.

3.5 Whilst beyond the development envelope set in the Core Strategy, the clear housing need and NPPF’s presumption in favour of sustainable development provide powerful arguments to approve this planning application. This presumption can be fully applied and balanced against the restrictions of the Core Strategy. Such restrictions to not sit well with the NPPF’s emphasis on growth.

3.6 Government Policy is abundantly clear that where the development plan policies are out-of-date, then LPA’s should grant planning permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole. This application has shown that there is little in the way of adverse impacts. Any negative impacts that might exist are no worse than the other legitimate options. Without any overriding adverse and significant effects, a considered and balanced judgement should conclude that the application be granted.

4 THE SITE AND ITS ENVIRONMENT

4.1 The development site, which is broadly rectangular in shape, with a depth of over 50 metres and an approximate site area of 0.2 ha., lies along Hod Hall Lane, outside the development envelope of Haddenham, in an area designated as “countryside”. The Lane runs eastwards at right angles from Lode Way. The first 90m, or so, of the Lane (from its junction with Lode Way) is adopted highway; further east the lane is private, including that part adjacent the site. Hod Hall Lane terminates at small group of established gypsy pitches about 180 metres from the junction with Lode Way. The application site has a frontage of 40 metres on to the lane. It is currently vacant, although was last used (and has a longstanding historic use) as builders yard. There is a large brick storage building situated towards the rear (south-west corner) of the site. The northern edge of the site has hardened bases where sheds once existed but these were removed in recent times. Large metal gates are located at the vehicular entrance to the site from the lane.

4.2 There is a mature tree and hedgerow line at the front of the site to the lane, set back behind a rough verge. The opposite side of Hod Hall Lane comprises agricultural land. To the rear is a field currently used as paddocks, which is separated from the site by a post and rail fence and a ditch. To the west is a plot of unmanaged scrub and woodland about 55 metres wide separating the
site from the rear of 27 and 29 Lode Way. To the east are two 20 metre wide plots, the nearest with ramshackle buildings set behind a gated vehicular access, the other containing impenetrable undergrowth. There are trees and shrubs along this eastern boundary. The site is not in a designated flood risk area, and there is a mains sewer running along the Lane.

5  **PLANNING HISTORY**

5.1  
03/00043/OUT Conversion of builder's yard to four residential plots  Refused  19.03.2003  
08/00965/FUL Change of use from builders yard & offices to a travellers site with 4 pitches  Refused  21.01.2009  
09/00168/FUL Change of use from builders yard & offices to a traveller's site with 1 No. pitch (comprising of 3 No. mobile homes and 1 No. utility block)  Refused  18.06.2009  
12/00213/FUL Change of use from builders yard & offices to 3 pitches for gypsy/travellers  Refused  28.05.2012

6  **REPLIES TO CONSULTATIONS**

6.1 Site notice posted on metal doors to site and 19 neighbouring properties notified. Comments received from 3 neighbouring properties making the following comments:

- The proposal is contrary to Council Policy
- The site and owner has been successful after 5 years in obtaining planning permission for 3 travellers pitches, which were to be for his family – to apply for an alternative use is pure commercial gain
- Another application for market housing on the site was refused, as would be the case for any other applicant as the site is outside the settlement boundary
- My opposition to previous traveller pitch applications was on drainage, access, environmental and ecological grounds, not discrimination. To support this application, after the Appeal decision, would be hypocritical.
- As the site is outside the settlement boundary I do not see how this can be considered as a serious application
- The site is unsuitable for building without extensive ground works to alleviate severe drainage problems resulting from surface water
drainage running from higher land houses on the site will exacerbate this problem
- The contaminated land issue remains relevant, a desk top study is not sufficient as it does not meet the Inspector’s condition
- The rejection by the Parish Council was unanimous. Approval will lead to other applications from adjacent landowners and the Council may be liable to action from applicants who were refused permission to build on the site.
- As an adjoining site owner, where a traveller’s site has been approved, I can see little reason for rejecting what is likely to be a smaller development, which would have less people. The existing traveller’s site could be divided in future for 10 pitches.
- A thick boundary hedge/planting should be provided to the southern boundary.
- There is asbestos on the roof of the existing building, which should be carefully removed if the building is to be demolished
- Drainage is a problem, and I would not want to see the ditch on the southern boundary overwhelmed.
- Access is poor, Hod Hall Lane is narrow and the junction with Lode Way has poor visibility
- The application should be approved as current policy would mean it would be rejected at appeal, if refused.

6.2 **County Councillor:**
**Bill Hunt:** This application is outside the development envelope and therefore it should not be considered as it can only be considered as an exception site. My understanding is that exception sites can only be used for traveller pitches or affordable housing, this application is neither. Approval of this application could put the Authority at risk of challenge from previous applicants who have had an application declined.

6.3 **Ward Councillor:**
**Pauline Wilson:** I would like to call in this application as the site has been subject to an appeal hearing which caused a great deal of public interest and concern. We have consulted local residents and 40% would prefer bungalows on the site, 27% wanted houses and 4.5% wanted it to remain a travellers site. Other uses suggested were a paddock or a builders yard.

The Parish Council planning committee met and decided to oppose the application because some residents attended and a few vociferous people spoke. Some said it was not fair as other people are not allowed to build in the countryside and in 2005 ECDC had not allowed houses on the land.

My concerns are that the silent majority were not heard at the PC meeting and those that did not attend. This ‘call-in’ would give them chance to write to express their views. I want the Planning Committee to consider the residents of East Cambs who live near this site and decide in their best interests.
6.4 **Parish Council:** Recommend refusal as the site is outside the development envelope; the land is heavy clay and prone to flooding; all of the houses in Lode Way have soak away problems and this would also apply on the site; a mains sewer runs down Hod Hall Lane and heavy lorries could damage it; the access road is not suitable for emergency, refuse and recycling vehicles; the yard should be checked for contamination; a wildlife survey is needed. The Parish Council objects to this application on planning grounds for **all or any** dwellings, as the land is not suitable to live on.

6.5 **Environmental Health:** I have no adverse comments. Please send developers guidance notes.

6.6 **Waste Strategy:** Residents would need to take wheeled bins and black sacks to the highway boundary.

6.7 **Trees Officer:** The previous application for 3 gypsy/traveller pitches was approved at appeal when the Inspector imposed a landscape condition, with a specific clause for a 5m wide strip on the southern boundary. No tree survey has been submitted but any reserved matters application would require a landscape condition, with the southern boundary planting, a tree survey and arboricultural impact assessment, and a tree/hedge protection plan. In its current forms the application does not demonstrate sustainable retention of existing vegetation or any provision for additional planting.

6.8 **County Highways (précis):**
I note this is an outline application with access to be determined now. I also note that the application follows on from a successful appeal decision in relation to 3 traveller pitches on the site (12/00213/ful).

The first 90m of Hod Hall Lane is un-made public highway. Thereafter, the Lane is a private road. The un-made surface of the Lane is not suitable to serve market housing. CCC would certainly not be able to maintain the surface to a standard that would guarantee accessibility for users of mobility scooters / wheelchairs or pushchairs / buggies. A 3m-wide hardened single lane carriageway built to CCC specifications would be sufficient. A passing place located along the frontage of the site would be required as condition 7 of the Inspector’s decision. I estimate that the rough cost of the highway works would be about £30,000. If you consider that this amount is fairly and reasonably related in scale to the development, then a condition must be placed on any consent granted to ensure the improvement of the approach road. If, however, you consider that £30,000 would not be fairly and reasonably related in scale to the development, then I recommend refusal on the grounds that **the approach road of Hod Hall Lane is considered to be inadequate to serve the development by reason of its substandard construction.**

The indicative site layout demonstrates adequate parking and turning space. The visibility at the Hod Hall Lane / Lode Way junction is poor, due to
vegetation encroaching into the highway verge and CCC has powers to require removal if necessary. Conditions re cycle parking/car parking and access and also road improvements to be imposed.

7 THE PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

7.1 East Cambridgeshire Core Strategy 2009

CS1 Spatial Strategy
CS2 Housing
CS3 Gypsy traveller and Showpeoples Sites
H4 Affordable housing exceptions
H5 Dwellings for rural workers
EN1 Landscape and settlement character
EN2 Design
S4 Developer contribution
S6 Transport impact

7.2 Supplementary Planning Documents

Design Guide 2012

8 CENTRAL GOVERNMENT POLICY

8.1 National Planning Policy Framework 2012

6 Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
7 Requiring good design
4 Promoting sustainable transport

9 PLANNING COMMENTS

9.1 This site is outside the settlement boundary for Haddenham and has planning consent, gained at appeal for a travellers site for 3 pitches, each with 2 caravans on them, this being limited by planning condition. The main issues to consider in dealing with this application are:

- the principle of development on the site and sustainability;
- loss of a travellers site for 3 pitches;
- housing need;
- impact on the character of the area and ecology;
- design and layout;
- residential amenity;
- highways and access;
- drainage and infrastructure;
- developer contributions.

9.2 The principle of development on the site and sustainability
The site is outside the settlement boundary, and therefore designated as being in the open countryside, where development is severely restricted and
new houses require special justification. Core Strategy policy CS1 sets out the exceptions allowed, which include development which is essential to the efficient operation of local agriculture, horticulture, forestry, mineral extraction, and outdoor recreation, or to other uses specifically identified in the local plan which support the rural economy, help meet affordable housing or special housing need, or provide essential rural services or infrastructure. Policy CS2 (Housing) sets out the residential exceptions allowed outside settlement boundaries, which are affordable housing, sites for gypsies and travellers, dwellings for essential rural workers, alterations to or replacement of dwellings, or the re-use or replacement of existing buildings. As this proposal is for up to four market dwellings, the proposal does not comply with the above policies.

9.3 The applicant states that current Core Strategy policies are out of date and do not comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012. He refers to the NPPF which states in paragraphs 14 and 15 that where a local plan is in conflict with its policies, or is silent on the issue under consideration, then permission should be granted, and that “All plans should be based upon and reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development....” He further quotes Proposed Draft Local Plan Growth 5 (Presumption on favour of sustainable development) in that regard and makes the case that Haddenham is a sustainable settlement and therefore the development should be approved. It is agreed that Haddenham is a relatively sustainable settlement, hence its designation as a Key Service Centre. However, whilst the Core Strategy was adopted in 2009, its policies of controlling development in the countryside to protect the countryside from urban sprawl are reflected in the NPPF, which states as paragraph 55 that “Local authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances such as: the essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work...” other exceptions are listed but these are not relevant to this case. Proposed Growth Policy 5 does indeed state that sustainable development will be supported, subject to certain criteria “Where there are no policies relevant to the application or policies are out of date at the time of making the decision....” This is not the case in dealing with this application as it can be seen that Policy CS1 and CS2 do reflect current Government policy, and the tenor of these policies is proposed in Policy Growth 2 (Locational Strategy) of the Draft Local Plan which is to be Examined early next year. The concept of settlement boundaries to control urban sprawl is long established, and there is no proposal, at present to alter the settlement boundary in this part of Haddenham. Settlement boundaries provide consistency and an element of certainty developers and to planning decisions.

9.4 The applicant also states that proposed Draft Local Plan Policy Growth 6 (Community-led development) would support the proposal. However this policy relates to affordable housing outside settlement boundaries, and open market housing only where there are demonstrable viability issues over delivery of affordable housing, or the benefits of the proposal, such as the
level of affordable housing or open space, are greater than would have been
delivered on an open market site. The argument that this proposal would be
responding to ‘localism’ as local people were opposed to a travellers site, and
“is responding to community concerns and perhaps represents a
development which would be more acceptable to the settled community, as
well as countryside character” is not supported by the policy cited, nor in the
number and tone of responses received in response to this application, or the
Parish Council’s views.

9.5 Potential loss of a traveller’s site
Local Authorities are required to consider and plan for the accommodation
needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople as set out in the
Housing Act 2004. The Government’s guidance on ‘Planning policy for
traveller sites’ (March 2012) requires that local planning authorities set pitch
targets for gypsies and travellers and plot targets for travelling showpeople
which address the likely site accommodation needs of travellers in their area.
Local authorities are also required to identify specific deliverable gypsy and
traveller and travelling showpeople sites where there is an identified need for
additional accommodation, equating to a minimum of 10 years supply. The
ability to illustrate such a supply assists in determining windfall applications.
In developing Policy HOU9 (Gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople
sites), the draft Local Plan shows that there is a need for 23 pitches between
2011 and 2021. Counting in the three pitches approved on this site at appeal,
and proposed allocation sites (4 pitches), the Council can show that 24 sites
will be provided during this period. However, should these pitches be lost,
then only 21 could be counted, leaving a residual of 2 pitches to be found
prior to the Examination of the policy early next year. The text to the policy
states that whilst the Council has a good track record of positively considering
windfall sites, future windfall sites cannot be included in the calculations as
they are presently unknown. The loss of this site for traveller use, would
therefore have a significant impact on the Council’s ten year supply of gypsy
and traveller sites, and consequent impact on determining future applications.

9.6 Housing need:
Continuing the assertion that current Core Strategy policy is not up to date,
the applicant quotes paragraph 49 of the NPPF which states that “Relevant
policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the
local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable
housing sites.” Housing supply is published in the Annual Monitoring Report
(AMR) and is constantly being reviewed and up-dated as a rolling programme
as houses are completed and new sites are proposed. The applicant states
that the January 2013 AMR does not adequately demonstrate a deliverable 5
year supply and dispute the way in which the figures are calculated. However, the latest published version of the AMR is that submitted to the
Secretary of State on 29th August this year, and that version is currently being
updated for the Examination of the Draft Local Plan. The figures are drawn
from outstanding commitments, large potential sites within settlements, and
allocations in the local plan. Whilst some of the sites do not yet have
planning permission, detailed discussions have been held with the development industry, particularly in respect of allocation sites, to obtain a realistic timescale for development proposals. It must also be noted that this district has a high number of 'windfall' applications, and these figures are not included in the 5 year supply. The Authority is therefore confident that the required 5 year supply of housing sites is available. The Housing Supply Paper (September 2013) shows that 3,595 dwellings are likely to come forward over the district, and the housing target is 3,450, the supply therefore meets the required target and this current proposal is not essential to meet housing need.

9.7 **Impact on the character of the area and ecology**

Policies CS1 and EN6 seek to protect, preserve and, where possible, enhance the settlement edge, space between settlements and their wider landscape setting and existing ecological and other natural features. In contrast to Lode Way, which has housing of various types on both sides, there is no housing in Hod Hall Lane, although there are stables and travellers sites at the far eastern end. Those sites, and the application site, are well screened from public view by the surrounding vegetation. They have been well integrated both socially and environmentally into the locality. Hod Hall Lane is a relatively tranquil part of the village, outside the settlement boundary. There are two parcels of land between the proposal site and the closest approved gypsy/traveller site. There is also a considerable parcel of land on the opposite side of Hod Hall Lane. Whilst the current proposal site has a hedge on the frontage which will provide some screening, the character of the Lane will be altered by the addition of up to 4 dwellings, primarily by the increased traffic movements and general increase in noise from the additional families. The Council has concerns that any further building encroachment would set a precedent. The thrust of policies CS1 and EN1 seek to preserve the countryside for its own sake. The Inspector, in considering the appeal for a traveller’s site, took the view that development on the site would not be easily seen from public vantage points and surrounding vegetation screens the site from properties on Lode Way and Metcalfe Way. He considered that six caravans and two additional dayrooms would be visible at close quarters and the level of activity associated with the site would affect the quiet rural character of the lane. However the impact would be localised and, having regard to the previous use as a builders yard, he did not find that there would be a significant detriment to the character and appearance of the countryside. However, he imposed a landscaping condition as existing ‘screening’ vegetation could not be relied upon.

9.8 This proposal is much different in character from the appeal case. Caravans, mobile homes and day rooms are essentially single storey and can therefore be more easily screened. They are also the type of development which exists in the lane, and which is common on the edge of settlements in the district. It is likely that even single storey dwellings would be more conspicuous in height, and that would certainly be the case with two storey properties, which although shown only indicatively on the submitted layout plan, do illustrate
what could be accommodated on the site. Although that is a matter which would be considered at reserved matters stage, should this application be supported. The applicant makes the case that this small scale housing may be less harmful to the countryside character than its use as a builder’s yard or for the permitted traveller use. However, apart from the potential detrimental impact from built form on the site, and the resultant ‘urbanisation’ of this quiet lane, there is also the potential for increased comings and goings from 4 family dwellings as opposed to 3 family pitches. It is therefore considered that introducing permanent built form in this location would have a more adverse impact on the character of the area than the use recently approved at appeal, and would therefore be contrary to policies CS1 and EN1. It was established during the appeal that there are no particular ecological features requiring specific protection.

9.9 **Design and layout:**
Whilst this is a matter reserved for later consideration, the indicative layout plan does show how the site could be developed for up to 4 dwelling. It shows adequate parking and turning area and good orientation of buildings to achieve maximum solar gain. The applicant states that the properties would be built to sustainable standards. However, the indicative layout does suggest that the optimum layout for accommodating four units on the site would be 2 blocks of semi-detached two storey properties, the impact of which is discussed above.

9.10 **Residential amenity:**
There are no immediate residential neighbours who would be affected by the proposals, and therefore there would be unlikely to be any adverse impact in respect of overshadowing or loss of privacy. The only likely impact would be increased noise and disturbance from comings and goings to the neighbouring property at the corner of Lode Way. There would also be an issue in respect of waste collection as the highway is not adopted and refuse would have to be taken to, and left at the junction with Lode Way, for collection.

9.11 **Highways and access:**
As already reported, the first 90m of Hod Hall Lane is un-made public highway. Thereafter, the Lane is a private road. Bearing in mind the difficulty in finding suitable sites to meet the need for traveller pitches in the district and the location of / access to other approved traveller sites within the district, improvements to the surface of Hod Hall Lane were not sought by Highways Development Management for 12/00213/FUL. Hence, the Inspector did not require the surface of the Lane to be improved. However, it is County Highway’s view that the un-made surface of the Lane is not suitable to serve market housing. The County Council would certainly not be able to maintain the surface to a standard that would guarantee accessibility for users of mobility scooters / wheelchairs or pushchairs / buggies.
9.12 County Highways estimate that the cost of building a 90m length of standard residential estate road would be £50,000 - £70,000, which would be out of proportion to the proposed development. They have therefore considered the level of traffic along Hod Hall Lane and have concluded that a 3m-wide hardened single lane carriageway built to County specifications would be sufficient. A passing place located along the frontage of the site would be required as condition 7 of the Inspector’s decision, and it is estimated that the rough cost of the highway works would be about £30,000. County Highways have suggested that if this amount is considered fairly and reasonably related in scale to the development, then a condition must be placed on any consent granted to ensure the improvement of the approach road. However if this would not be considered fairly and reasonably related in scale to the development, then refusal on the grounds that the approach road of Hod Hall Lane is considered to be inadequate to serve the development by reason of its substandard construction is recommended. In planning terms it is considered that as County Highways require a 3m wide road to be built to their specification to ensure its safe use, then this would have to be achieved through a planning condition. It is considered fair and reasonable to require the highway to be safe. As to the cost, that is an issue that the developer would have to consider in any future sale or development of the site. As a solution could be reached on obtaining a safe access, it is not considered this could reasonably form a reason for refusal of the application.

9.13 With regard to the internal layout shown on the indicative plans, adequate parking and turning space could be provided within the site. County Highways also acknowledge that visibility at the Hod Hall Lane / Lode Way junction is poor at the current time but this is due to vegetation encroaching into the highway verge and CCC has powers to require removal of the vegetation if necessary. Conditions have been proposed regarding cycle and car parking and turning areas and also upgrading of the road. Consequently it is considered that if the works proposed by the Highway authority were carried out the proposal would accord with Policies S6 and S7 which seek to ensure safe highway access and adequate parking.

9.14 **Drainage and infrastructure:**
Despite the concerns raised by local residents and the Parish Council, the Inspector considered that this issue could be addressed by imposition of a planning condition as the site is not in an area designated as at risk of flooding. As this proposal would be unlikely to increase the hard surfaced area significantly, it is considered it would be unreasonable to refuse the application on grounds of surface water drainage. The previous application for a traveller’s site confirmed that foul water could be accommodated within the existing mains system. Electricity and mains water could be made available.
9.15 **Developer contributions:**
Should the development be approved, then Community Infrastructure Levy payment would be required. There would be no requirement for affordable housing as there are less than 5 units proposed.

9.16 **Summary:**
This outline application proposes up to 4 market dwellings on a site in the countryside which has recently been granted planning approval for a traveller’s site, at appeal. As the site is in the countryside, development is strictly controlled by Policy CS1 and Policy CS2 lists exceptions which would be allowed. This proposal does not fall within those exceptions, and a previous application for four residential plots on the site in 2003 was refused on policy grounds. The potential loss of 3 traveller’s sites is also of concern, as the Council needs to show a ten year supply, and this may lead to sites having to be sought elsewhere in the district. The outline application seeks approval for access only at this stage, and County Highways have recommended that whilst the indicative layout shows adequate parking and turning, the access road needs to be upgraded to ensure it is safe. Whilst this is not a reason for refusal, it would be a costly endeavour. Given that the proposal is contrary to Policies CS1 and CS2, and also National Planning Policy Framework guidance, the application is recommended for REFUSAL.

10 **RECOMMENDATION**
RECOMMENDATION: REFUSAL
The site is located outside the development envelope of Haddenham and is classified as 'countryside', where there is a policy of strict control over residential development. Exceptions to this policy of control may include affordable or special needs housing; traveller’s sites, replacement dwellings or dwellings essential to rural enterprises. The application proposal does not fall within any of the exceptions allowed, and is therefore contrary to Policies CS1, and CS2 of the Core Strategy, and advice contained in paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

11 **APPENDICES**
None