

Sustainable development: I note that Jade identifies that there are no exceptions for housing that would apply here but she then raises the presumption in favour of sustainable development (NPPF para 11d) and suggests that 43 dwellings should be afforded great weight in the overall planning balance. I am not clear whether the balance applies at all if the proposal fails to show that it is sustainable. The iTransport Technical Note confirms that (unlike the earlier development) the location is **not** sustainable with regard to access to employment sites, supermarkets, further education facilities and the town centre. The location oversteps the recommended distance limits. With regard to sustainable housing design, the absence of a detailed application means that there is no evidence to demonstrate how the proposal will conform or deal with issues such as this and noise protection.

My question is "If the evidence confirms that the location is unsustainable, does the planning balance come into play at all?"

Impact upon Conservation Area: I can find no reference in Rachael's advice to the impact of the proposed means of vehicular access. The current situation arising from the consent for 50 dwellings is that the Old Manor Farm buildings will lie adjacent to a cul de sac with a landscape buffer softening the detrimental impact of this relationship. The proposal radically changes this relationship. It introduces 7.5m of highway works, yet to be approved by the Highway Authority, and brings all of the traffic generated by the proposed 43 dwellings through this sensitive gap. I consider this amounts to substantial harm.

My first question is "When considering the impact of the proposal on the setting of the Conservation Area, has great weight been given to the asset's conservation in reaching a conclusion on the degree of harm inflicted by the proposals? My related second question is "Given the potential harm, what steps have been taken to explore alternative, less sensitive, means of access that would result in less substantial harm to the setting of the Conservation Area?"

I look forward to your response. I appreciate that time has now become critical.