

NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

LOCAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE – 9 SEPTEMBER 2014

Title of report	UPDATE IN RESPECT OF THE STRATEGIC HOUSING MARKET ASSESSMENT
Contacts	<p>Councillor Trevor Pendleton 01509 569746 trevor.pendleton@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</p> <p>Director of Services 01530 454555 steve.bambrick@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</p> <p>Planning Policy and Business Focus Team Manager 01530 454677 ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</p>
Purpose of report	To provide the Advisory Committee with an update in respect of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment
Council Priorities	<p>These are taken from the Council Delivery Plan:</p> <p>Value for Money Business and Jobs Homes and Communities Green Footprints Challenge</p>
Implications:	
Financial/Staff	The Council has contributed towards the preparation of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment along with all other authorities in the Housing Market Area. The cost of this has been met from within existing budgets.
Link to relevant CAT	None
Risk Management	The preparation of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) is a key piece of evidence to demonstrate that the Council is making adequate provision for housing as part of the local plan. Failure to have an up-to-date SHMA would represent a significant risk that the local plan would be found unsound. For the reasons outlined in the report the preparation of an alternative SHMA represents an additional risk to the Local Plan.
Equalities Impact Screening	None

Human Rights	None
Transformational Government	Not applicable.
Comments of Head of Paid Service	The report is satisfactory
Comments of Section 151 Officer	The report is satisfactory
Comments of Monitoring Officer	The report is satisfactory
Consultees	None
Background papers	<p>National Planning Policy Framework which can be found at http://www.planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/</p> <p>National Planning Practice Guidance which can be found at http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/local-plans/</p> <p>Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Housing Market Assessment – copies of the report are held by the Planning policy Team (Room 102).</p>
Recommendations	<p>THAT THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE NOTES;</p> <p>(I) THE PROPOSAL TO AGREE A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING IN RESPECT OF THE AMOUNT AND DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING;</p> <p>(II) THE FACT THAT AN ALTERNATIVE SHMA HAS BEEN PRODUCED AND ANY FURTHER UPDATE WILL BE PROVIDED AT THE MEETING</p>

1.0 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Members will recall that at the meeting of the Advisory Committee on 3 June 2014 a report was considered which outlined the findings of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and the next steps in agreeing the amount and distribution of new housing across the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area (HMA).
- 1.2 This report provides an update for the Advisory Committee on these matters.

2.0 UPDATE

- 2.1 The SHMA was presented and endorsed at the meeting of the Members Advisory Group (MAG) on July 17 2014.

- 2.2 At a further meeting of MAG on 24 July 2014 it was agreed that a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) be agreed in respect of the amount and distribution of housing across the HMA. In particular, there is consensus that up until 2031 all the authorities can meet their objectively assessed housing need without the need for any redistribution subject to some modelling by the county Highways Authority around transport.
- 2.3 A report on the MOU will be considered by Cabinet at its meeting in October and by Council in November.
- 2.4 Since the completion of the SHMA, an alternative SHMA has been produced in support of a planning application in Blaby District Council area. This application was submitted directly to the Planning Inspectorate for their determination as a result of Blaby district Council having been placed in special measures.
- 2.5 The 'alternative' SHMA suggested significantly different housing requirements from those in the Leicester and Leicestershire SHMA. Across the HMA it identified a need for 7,082 dwellings per annum compared to between 3,775 and 4,215 dwellings per annum in the Leicester and Leicestershire SHMA. In North West Leicestershire the comparable figures were 828 dwellings per annum and 350 dwellings per annum respectively.
- 2.6 The planning application itself was refused but in determining the application the Inspector considered both SHMAs. He noted that they both used as their starting point the latest CLG household projections from 2011, informed by the 2008 projections to take account of the impact of the recession on trends in household formation and factored in predictions for employment growth from a common source (albeit with slightly different dates); and both state that they have been prepared following the advice of the recently-published Planning Practice Guidance. However, he noted that they produced significantly different results.
- 2.7 The Inspector commented that "*The disparity of their output suggests strongly that certainly one, or conceivably both of the assessments will be significantly in error, but the evidence before me does not allow me to reach a definitive conclusion*".
- 2.8 The Inspector also noted that the very substantial differences between the two SHMAs amply serves to illustrate the statement in the Planning Practice Guidance issued by Government that establishing future need is not an exact science; and that no single approach will provide a definitive answer. It also emphasises how essential it is that evidence such as SHMAs must be rigorously tested in order to establish that it is robust.
- 2.9 As the Inspector noted establishing need is not an exact science. The fact that it is not an exact science means that any results are always open to challenge. Therefore, the findings of the SHMA were always potentially going to be subject to some form of challenge. Although the Inspector, given the information before him, felt unable to support either SHMA, it does not alter the fact that the Leicester and Leicestershire SHMA represents, from the point of the view of the HMA local planning authorities, the appropriate housing requirements.
- 2.10 The fact that the results of the SHMA were always going to be open to challenge represents a risk, not only to this Council's Local Plan but also the Local Plans of all the HMA authorities. It should be appreciated that it is not possible, for the reasons outlined by the Inspector in the Blaby decision, to mitigate such risks completely.

- 2.11 However, this risk can, and has, been mitigated through the employment of reputable independent consultants who have a track record of producing similar studies elsewhere and who follow national guidance in undertaking the study. The authorities across the HMA continue will look to engage GL Hearn at the appropriate time to provide evidence to inspectors where necessary to show the robust nature of the HMA SHMA.
- 2.12 Notwithstanding the above it remains the case that the production of the alternative SHMA, together with any others which may be produced, represents an additional potential risk which will be added to the risk register for the Local Plan.
- 2.13 In terms of risk assessment it is possible to be certain as to the likelihood of challenge. Members may be aware that the Charnwood Core Strategy Examination was suspended earlier on this year. The Examination is scheduled to reconvene later on in 2014 or early 2015 and so this is likely to be where the Leicester and Leicestershire SHMA will be tested.
- 2.14 There is much less certainty as to the likelihood of such a challenge being successful. This matter will need to be kept under review alongside all the other risks which could potentially affect the Local Plan. The issue of risks associated with the Local Plan is considered in the report at Item 2 of this agenda.

NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

LOCAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE – 9 SEPTEMBER 2014

Title of report	PLAN PERIOD UPDATE
Contacts	<p>Councillor Trevor Pendleton 01509 569746 trevor.pendleton@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</p> <p>Director of Services 01530 454555 steve.bambrick@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</p> <p>Planning Policy and Business Focus Team Manager 01530 454677 ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</p>
Purpose of report	To advise members that it is considered appropriate to amend the plan period from that previously agreed by the Advisory Committee.
Council Priorities	<p>These are taken from the Council Delivery Plan:</p> <p>Value for Money Business and Jobs Homes and Communities Green Footprints Challenge</p>
Implications:	
Financial/Staff	None
Link to relevant CAT	None
Risk Management	A risk assessment of the project has been undertaken. As far as possible control measures have been put in place to minimise these risks, including monthly Project Board meetings where risk is reviewed. Whilst there is a risk associated with changing the plan period, it is considered that such a change can be justified and so represents a low risk.
Equalities Impact Screening	None
Human Rights	None
Transformational Government	Not applicable.

Comments of Head of Paid Service	The report is satisfactory
Comments of Section 151 Officer	The report is satisfactory
Comments of Monitoring Officer	The report is satisfactory
Consultees	None
Background papers	<p>Minutes of meeting of the Local Plan Advisory Committee 18 March 2014 which can be viewed at Agenda for Local Plan Advisory Committee on Tuesday, 18th March, 2014, 5.30 pm - North West Leicestershire District Council</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework which can be found at http://www.planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/</p> <p>Report to Cabinet of 29 July 2014 which can be viewed at Agenda for Cabinet on Tuesday, 29th July, 2014, 5.00 pm - North West Leicestershire District Council</p>
Recommendations	THAT THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS TO COUNCIL THAT THE LOCAL PLAN PERIOD IS AMENDED TO COVER 2011-2031.

1.0 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Members will recall that at the meeting of the Advisory Committee on 18 March 2014 it was agreed to recommended to Council that:
- (I) A new Local Plan be produced incorporating strategic policies, allocations and some detailed policies; and
 - (II) The plan period cover the period 2011-2036.
- 1.2 The minutes of the Advisory Committee meeting were reported to Cabinet at its meeting of 29 July 2014. In the report it was noted that due to changes in circumstances since the meeting of the Advisory Committee it was now suggested that the Plan period should be for 2011-2031. Cabinet asked, therefore, that the Advisory Committee re-consider this issue.

2.0 WHY CHANGE THE PLAN PERIOD?

- 2.1 The reason for suggesting a change in the plan period is that since this issue was considered by the Advisory Committee, the Member Advisory Group (MAG), which is a member group representing each of the planning authorities in the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area, has met and has indicated that in terms of reaching an agreement on the amount and distribution of new housing this should cover the period to 2031. The basis for the MAG reaching this conclusion is due to the fact that the current

transport modelling work for the Housing Market Area currently only looks at the period to 2028 and therefore having plan periods to 2031 minimises the additional modelling work required to have a comprehensive set of plans in place. More importantly however the recommendation to run plans to 2031 is based on the fact that all planning authorities in the Housing Market Area have confirmed that they are able to accommodate their housing needs within their respective areas up to that date thereby avoiding the need for any re-distribution.

2.2 In considering the issue of the appropriate Plan Period it is necessary to consider what the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) says.

2.3 Paragraph 159 that states local plans should:

"be drawn up over an appropriate time scale, *preferably* a 15-year time horizon, take account of longer term requirements, and be kept up to date"

However the NPPF also states at para 47 that the local plan should:

"identify a supply of specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth, for years 6-10 and, *where possible*, for years 11-15"

2.4 Given the Local Plan will not be adopted at the earliest until the end of 2016, an end date of 2031 would of course be just short of 15 years. The longer date (2036) would, as the Advisory Committee have already been advised be preferable and fits better with NPPF in this regard.

2.5 However there is consensus across the Housing Market Area that up until 2031 all the authorities can meet their objectively assessed housing need without the need for any redistribution subject to some modelling by the County Highways Authority around transport. It is advised that it would likely have to be something of real significance for any constraint including transport to persuade an Inspector that any plan meeting housing would otherwise be found unsound on the '15 year rule'. This seems to be supported by the Inspector for the Charnwood Hearing being content that the submitted plan has an end date of 2028 (14 year time horizon).

2.6 If the Council is to continue with a plan end date of 2036, this poses a considerable risk of not being able to secure co-operation based on a robust evidence base, which is also a requirement of the NPPF and the Localism Act.

2.7 Therefore due to changed circumstances following publication of the SHMA and emerging information concerning SHLAAs, members are advised on balance that a credible argument could be advanced to support an end date of 2031 with a commitment that the authorities will be working together on a longer time horizon as the evidence base is rolled forward.

2.8 Should circumstances change again, a further report will be brought to the Local Plan Advisory Committee.

NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

LOCAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE – 9 SEPTEMBER 2014

Title of report	LIMITS TO DEVELOPMENT
Contacts	<p>Councillor Trevor Pendleton 01509 569746 trevor.pendleton@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</p> <p>Director of Services 01530 454555 steve.bambrick@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</p> <p>Planning Policy Team Manager 01530 454677 lan.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</p>
Purpose of report	To allow members to consider a review of Limits to Development.
Council Priorities	<p>These are taken from the Council Delivery Plan:</p> <p>Value for Money Business and Jobs Homes and Communities Green Footprints Challenge</p>
Implications:	
Financial/Staff	The resource implications of reviewing Limits to Development are set out in the report.
Link to relevant CAT	None
Risk Management	Limits to Development have provided a useful tool in assisting the Planning Authority determine development proposals. However, it is some years since they were prepared and a failure to review this important policy area will place the new Local Plan at risk of not providing a clear, up-to-date framework for decisions on what will or will not be permitted and where.
Equalities Impact Screening	None
Human Rights	None
Transformational Government	Not applicable

Comments of Head of Paid Service	The report is satisfactory
Comments of Section 151 Officer	The report is satisfactory
Comments of Monitoring Officer	The report is satisfactory
Consultees	Local Plan Project Board
Background papers	National Planning Policy Framework which can be found at www.gov.uk/government/publications?topics%5B%5D=planning-and-building North West Leicestershire Local Plan (2002) which can be found at https://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/local_plan
Recommendations	<p>THAT THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE:</p> <p>(I) NOTES THE LIMITATIONS OF SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES, PARTICULARLY WHERE THERE IS NO UP TO DATE PLAN OR THE LACK OF A 5 YEAR SUPPLY OF HOUSING LAND;</p> <p>(II) RECOMMENDS TO COUNCIL THAT BOUNDARIES FOR SUSTAINABLE SETTLEMENTS BE DEFINED AS PART OF THE NEW LOCAL PLAN;</p> <p>(III) AGREES THAT OFFICERS PREPARE DRAFT BOUNDARIES FOR THOSE SETTLEMENTS LISTED IN PARAGRAPH 4.5 OF THIS REPORT AND;</p> <p>(IV) NOTESTHAT WORKSHOP(S) WILL BE ARRANGED TO ALLOW ALL MEMBERS TO BE INVOLVED IN DISCUSSION AND GUIDANCE ON THE PREPARATION OF SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES.</p>

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Limits to Development are a commonly used tool in Local Plans that provide clear, defensible boundaries around settlements within which development will normally be confined. They have been used as a planning policy tool in North West Leicestershire for a considerable time. Limits to Development are currently defined on the North West Leicestershire Local Plan (2002) proposals map for all the settlements in the district, including in some instances small groups of houses.
- 1.2 Limits to Development distinguish between areas of development and development potential and areas of restraint, such as countryside. In particular, 'saved' Local Plan policies S2 (Limits to Development) and S3 (Countryside) refer to Limits to Development (Appendix A).

2. THE NEED TO REVIEW LIMITS TO DEVELOPMENT

- 2.1 Although Limits to Development are defined in the 2002 adopted Local Plan, their preparation dates back to the 1990s, so they have not been fully reviewed for over 20 years. At the time they allowed for some new development. As these opportunities have been realised so the remaining opportunities for new development have become more constrained.
- 2.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) makes it clear that relevant policies for the supply of housing, which include Limits to Development, should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. As a consequence of the Council recently being in a position of not being able to demonstrate a five-year land supply, a significant amount of housing development has been granted beyond Limits to Development.
- 2.3 Therefore it is important for members to note that limits to development, however defined, cannot be an absolute security against development in perpetuity and as circumstances change there may then be opportunities for development to take place outside of those limits. The most common reasons for this occurring are not having an up to date plan and also not being able to demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land. Both these circumstances have recently impacted on North West Leicestershire and may also occur again.
- 2.4 The case for reviewing Limits to Development as part of the preparation of the new Local Plan is therefore overwhelming.

3. REVIEW OF OPTIONS

- 3.1 Some planning authorities have replaced the Limits to Development concept (sometimes also referred to as Settlement Boundaries, Village Envelopes etc.) with criteria-based policies. In these circumstances no boundary is defined around a settlement, but instead criteria are used to determine whether a proposal is acceptable or not. An example from a recently adopted Core Strategy is attached at Appendix B to this report to illustrate what such a policy might look like.
- 3.2 Whilst a criteria based policy approach does have some advantages, in particular the fact that it is more flexible, it also has significant disadvantages; most notably it will be less clear where development will or will not be permitted. Decisions will be less transparent and there is a likelihood of more planning appeals.
- 3.3 In North West Leicestershire, Limits to Development are a well understood planning tool for managing development. Limits to Development also:
 - a provide certainty: with a boundary shown on a Policies Map, Limits to Development make it clear what will or will not be permitted and where. They provide a transparent and consistent approach to development control decisions;
 - b allow for a more managed approach to housing growth;
 - c help check the unrestricted sprawl of built-up areas;
 - d prevent neighbouring settlements merging into one another;
 - e safeguard the countryside from encroachment;

- f help preserve the setting and special character of historic towns and villages; and
- g assists in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land;
- h facilitate the release of land for rural exception site affordable housing schemes and the provision of community facilities.

3.4 However, there are some significant disadvantages associated with Limits to Development:

- a Increased land values within Limits to Development impacts on housing affordability;
- b 'Town Cramming' and 'Garden Grabbing' are encouraged as a result of restricting development outside settlements to the detriment of settlement character and residential amenity;
- c Limits to Development are inflexible and are unable to respond to changing circumstances. They could very quickly become out-of-date again, particularly if the housing land supply fell below the 5 years plus 20% requirement.

3.5 Further, the preparation of new Limits to Development for some 40 settlements in the District will have significant resource implications as a result of:

- i The time taken to survey settlements and research planning histories and constraints (approximately one day for a typical settlement) in order to define Limits to Development; and
- ii The need to manage, administer and examine the anticipated increased volume and complexity of representations made with respect to new boundaries.

3.6 The impact on resources can be mitigated to some extent by reducing the number of settlements for which Limits to Development are considered appropriate will be prepared.

3.7 On balance it is considered that it would be appropriate to define Limits to Development (or equivalent) as part of the new Local Plan for sustainable settlements.

4. SUGGESTED APPROACH

4.1 In accordance with the NPPF, the new Local Plan will be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development. Limits to Development will direct development to the most sustainable locations and therefore it is more appropriate for them to be called 'Sustainable Settlement Boundaries'. A new title will also help distinguish the new boundaries from the previous Limits to Development defined in the 2002 Local Plan.

4.2 While a development strategy for North West Leicestershire remains to be agreed, the concentration of growth in the main settlements (Coalville Urban area, Ashby de la Zouch, Castle Donington, Ibstock, Kegworth and Measham) in comparison with other patterns of more dispersed development would accord with the fundamental planning objective to promote sustainable development.

4.3 In rural areas, some housing could be located where it would enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Therefore, Sustainable Settlement Boundaries could allow for

some rural housing development to help retain local services and community facilities such as schools, local shops, cultural venues, public houses and places of worship.

4.4 Although the North West Leicestershire Core Strategy was subsequently withdrawn, its approach to identifying what were considered to be sustainable rural communities received little or no objection. In it, Sustainable Villages were identified as those places which contained at least five of the following eight community services and facilities:

- i A General Store;
- ii A Primary School;
- iii A GP surgery;
- iv A Village hall or similar venue;
- v A recreation or sports ground;
- vi A public house;
- vii A daytime (i.e. 7am to 6pm) bus service, Monday-Saturday with a frequency of at least once an hour, to one or more higher order centres;
- viii Local employment opportunities other than employment associated with the above services.

4.5 Currently and on this basis, Sustainable Settlement Boundaries would need to be defined for the following settlements:

Albert Village, Appleby Magna, Ashby de la Zouch, Belton, Blackfordby, Breedon on the Hill, Castle Donington, Coalville Urban area, Coleorton (the Lower Moor Road area only), Diseworth, Donisthorpe, Ellistown, Heather, Ibstock, Kegworth, Long Whatton, Measham, Moira (including Norris Hill), Oakthorpe, Packington, Ravenstone, Swannington, Worthington.

4.6 There have also been recent appeal decisions that have examined the sustainability of settlements. In particular, an appeal at Tea Kettle Hall, Long Whatton Road, Diseworth (Ref: 13/00120/OUTM) where the Planning Inspector concluded that “*The location of the site is such that the proposal would be inherently unsustainable*”.

4.7 It will be noted that Diseworth was included in the list of Sustainable Villages in the Core Strategy. In view of this appeal decision it may be necessary to re-consider how sustainable rural communities are defined as part of the Local Plan’s development strategy.

4.8 However, at this early stage of plan preparation the longer list is considered to provide a suitable basis on which to move forward.

4.9 The remaining settlements with no or very limited services and facilities are not sustainable locations for development. While there will be no blanket restriction on all housing development in these places, opportunities will be more limited e.g. conversion, local needs housing. As a consequence, there will be no need to identify Sustainable Settlement Boundaries for settlements with no or limited services and facilities. These settlements will effectively be part of the countryside as far as planning policy is concerned and therefore not subject to unrestricted sprawl and inappropriate development.

5. NEXT STEP

- 5.1 As with other planning policies, proposals and designations the Local Plan preparation process will provide opportunity for engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods, local organisations and businesses on the definition of Sustainable Settlement Boundaries.
- 5.2 Subject to Members agreeing to the preparation of Sustainable Settlement Boundaries as outlined above, it is proposed to hold Informal Members Workshop(s) that allow all District Councillors to be involved in the early stages of preparing draft Sustainable Settlement Boundaries with a view to ensuring that , as far as possible, there is wide support and understanding of the process.
- 5.3 It is therefore proposed that officers prepare draft Sustainable Settlement Boundaries for the settlements identified at paragraph 4.5 above. These will then be used to support discussion at the Member Workshop(s).

NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE LOCAL PLAN (2002)

Policy S2

Development will be permitted on allocated sites and other land within the Limits to Development, identified on the Proposals Map, where it complies with the policies of this Local Plan.

Policy S3

Development will be permitted on land outside the Limits to Development, identified on the Proposals Map as Countryside, only where it:

- (a) Can be shown to be essential for the efficient long-term operation of agriculture and forestry;
- (b) Comprises acceptable farm diversification;
- (c) Is a public service or utility which cannot, for operational reasons, be accommodated within the defined Limits;
- (d) Is for recreation, community facilities, or tourism-related purposes, in accordance with the leisure and tourism policies of this Local Plan;
- (e) Is for Forest-related purposes within the National Forest, in accordance with the National Forest policies of this Local Plan; or
- (f) Involves the re-use, adaptation or conversion of rural buildings, in accordance with Policy E24 of this Local Plan.

EXTRACT FROM FENLAND CORE STRATEGY (POLICY CS12)

New development in villages will be supported where it contributes to the sustainability of that settlement and does not harm the wide open character of the countryside. Any proposal will need to satisfy the applicable policies of this document ... , as well as all the following criteria:

- a. The site is in or adjacent to the existing developed footprint* of the village; and
- b. It would not result in coalescence with any neighbouring village; and
- c. It would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside and farmland; and
- d. The proposal is of a scale and in a location that is in keeping with the core shape and form of the settlement, and will not adversely harm its character and appearance; and
- e. It would not extend existing linear features of the settlement, or result in ribbon development; and
- f. The site retains and respects natural boundaries such as trees, hedgerows, embankments and drainage ditches; and
- g. The site retains and respects ecological, archaeological and biodiversity features; and
- h. It would not result in the loss of important spaces within the village; and
- i. It would not result in the loss of high grade agricultural land, or if so, comprehensive evidence is provided to justify the loss. This should include an assessment of all alternative reasonable opportunities in the locality to develop on lower grades of agricultural land; and
- j. It would not put people or property in danger from identified risks; and
- k. It can be served by sustainable infrastructure provision, such as surface water and waste water drainage and highways.

If a proposal within or on the edge of a village would, in combination with other development built since April 2011 and committed to be built (i.e. with planning permission),

- a. increase the number of dwellings in the village by ..% or more; or
- b. for non-dwellings, have a floorspace of 1,000sq m or more or have an operational area (including, for example, parking and storage spaces) of 0.5ha or more,

then the proposal should have demonstrable evidence of strong local community support for the scheme (with such support generated via a thorough and proportionate pre-application community consultation exercise or a Neighbourhood Plan exercise).

** The developed footprint of the village is defined as the continuous built form of the settlement and excludes:*

(a) individual buildings and groups of dispersed, or intermittent buildings, that are clearly detached from the continuous built-up area of the settlement;

(b) gardens, paddocks, and other undeveloped land within the curtilage of buildings on the edge of the settlement where the land relates more to the surrounding countryside than to the built-up area of the settlement;

(c) agricultural buildings and associated land on the edge of the settlement;

(d) outdoor sports and recreation facilities and other formal open spaces on the edge of the settlement.